



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 117th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 167

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, OCTOBER 5, 2021

No. 175

Senate

The Senate met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. LEAHY).

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Eternal God, create in us a hunger and thirst for righteousness. May Your presence and power direct our actions. Strengthen our Senators to do the work of freedom. Rescue them from trouble and give them triumph over life's trials. Lord, remind them that all things are possible to those who believe in You.

O God, who rules forever, hear our prayers. Incline Your ears to us and grant us Your peace. Keep us from slipping as we trust You to save us.

We pray in Your great Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The President pro tempore led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Morning business is closed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will pro-

ceed to executive session to resume consideration of the following nomination, which the clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Paloma Adams-Allen, of the District of Columbia, to be a Deputy Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WARNOCK). The majority leader is recognized.

BUILD BACK BETTER

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, first, on Build Back Better, Democrats continue their work this week to iron out the details of our Build Back Better agenda—a once-in-a-generation opportunity to rebuild ladders for working families to reach the middle class, to help people stay in the middle class who are already there, and to secure another century of American prosperity.

Last night, I held another round of extensive talks with top officials from the White House, with the Speaker, and with my Senate colleagues. We made good progress, and we continue our talks later this week. There is more work to do, so we are going to keep at it. We are going to work at this every day until we can get it done.

I want to thank my colleagues, the Speaker, and the White House for everything they are doing to finalize this important bill. It is a rare opportunity to do something big for the American people, and we will press ahead until we pass both a bipartisan infrastructure bill and our Build Back Better agenda into law.

DEBT CEILING

Mr. President, now, on the debt ceiling, last night, as you know, I filed cloture on legislation sent to us by the House of Representatives that provides for a suspension of the debt ceiling until December of 2022.

The Senate is going to hold that vote tomorrow, and, once again, Members of

this body will face a choice: We can bring this Republican-manufactured debt ceiling crisis to a swift end or Republicans can keep barreling our country ever closer to the first default in American history.

By now, it is perfectly clear which political party is working to prevent a default on the debt and which party is deliberately and almost cynically rooting for one. Republicans have been offered multiple opportunities to deescalate this crisis they have created. Yet, each time, the Republican leader has chosen to magnify it instead.

Last week, Democrats offered a commonsense proposal that would have addressed the debt ceiling on a bipartisan basis; Republicans voted, instead, to default.

Democrats then offered Republicans what the Republican leader said they have wanted by proposing a simple majority vote—exactly what happened in the early 2000s—and, again, Republicans blocked it in favor of default.

By now, it is clear that despite what they say, Republicans seem intent on seeing the United States miss out on its payment for the first time ever. They seem perfectly at ease telling the American people, including our Active military, our Social Security recipients, and all those who rely on Medicare, that they are unequivocally the party of default—the Republicans are unequivocally the party of default. And some of them seem to be proud of it.

It is hard to believe that one of America's two major parties would be willing to jeopardize our entire economy and irrevocably damage our standing throughout the world just because they don't like that the party that won the election is following through on its agenda to help American families. But that is what is exactly going on here.

Now, to be clear—let's be very clear—tomorrow's vote is simply a cloture vote. It is not a vote to raise the debt ceiling; it is, rather, a procedural step to let Democrats raise the debt ceiling

• This “bullet” symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

S6897

on our own, just as Republicans have called for.

Let me say that again so all my Republican colleagues can hear it, and the American people can hear it loud and clear: Tomorrow's vote is simply a cloture vote. Tomorrow's vote is not a vote to raise the debt ceiling; it is, rather, a procedural step to let Democrats raise the debt ceiling on our own.

We are telling Republicans: We are not asking you to vote for it; just let us vote for it. And that is what you called for. That is what Leader McCONNELL has called for on countless occasions from July on.

As recently as yesterday, the Republican leader pointed to episodes in 2004 and 2006, while the majority raised the debt ceiling, while the minority voted against it. As happened then, the minority party can just get out of the way and let the majority supply the votes.

Tomorrow's vote, then, is a chance for Republican Senators to show that they don't have to link arm-in-arm with those extreme Members of their conference running for President. They have a chance to show that they are still responsible. It is not too late, but it is getting dangerously close.

As I said yesterday, this Chamber must send President Biden legislation to raise the debt ceiling before the end of the week. We do not have the luxury of using a drawn-out, convoluted, and risky process. We can resolve the debt ceiling crisis this week and reassure the world that the full faith and credit of the United States will never be in question.

Democrats are going to do the responsible thing tomorrow and vote yes to prevent a default.

There is still time—still time—for Republicans to get out of the way and allow this bill to pass with a simple majority vote. If Republicans want to vote no tomorrow, if they really want to be the party of default, that is their choice.

VOTING RIGHTS

Mr. President, now on voting rights, despite all we must do in the coming weeks, Senate Democrats remain strongly committed to advancing legislation in this Chamber to protect the most precious right in our democracy: the right to vote.

Later today, my friend the Senator from Vermont, Senator LEAHY, will introduce the new John Lewis Voting Rights Advancement Act. I am a cosponsor, and it is my intention in the coming weeks for the Senate to hold a vote on this bill.

As a complement of the Freedom to Vote Act, Senator LEAHY's bill restores some of the most critical safeguards of the original Voting Rights Act gutted by the Supreme Court's conservative majority in 2013.

Perhaps, most importantly, this proposal would reinstate the so-called "crown jewel" of the civil rights movement: the VRA's preclearance coverage formula, retailored for the 21st cen-

tury. It would also adopt new provisions to address the next generation of suppressive voting already sprouting in States, unfortunately, across the country.

Critically, this new bill also responds to the Court's troubling ruling in the *Brnovich* case of earlier this year, a decision which further weakened the VRA's protections against State practices that hinder minorities seeking to vote.

I will have more to say on this later, but, for now, I want to thank my colleague from Vermont for his diligence and leadership in our fight to protect our democracy.

The Senate must act soon if we are to successfully defeat the anti-democracy forces of the far right. And we will; we will do just that.

I yield the floor.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Republican leader is recognized.

DEBT CEILING

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, while the American people are battling inflation at its worst since 2008, Washington Democrats are behind closed doors, writing another reckless taxing-and-spending spree that would have the government borrow trillions upon trillions more. While our economy still struggles to fully recover from last year's COVID lockdowns, President Biden wants to slap Americans with the biggest tax hike in half a century.

You know, it is really remarkable to watch senior, established leaders in the Democratic Party take their marching orders from the radical left. We are hearing claims and arguments that are absurd on their face as top Democrats try to wrestle with the positions they have literally been forced into.

Yesterday, for example, President Biden's Twitter account made the following two claims in the space of two sentences. First, the "Build Back Better Agenda costs zero dollars." And then in the next sentence: "We're going to pay for it by ensuring those at the top and big corporations pay their fair share."

How amazing, Mr. President. It's the first time in human history something can be totally free, yet, nevertheless, needs to be paid for. The Democrats' socialist logic has become so advanced, they have transcended mathematics itself.

Of course, the truth is that the Democrats' massive tax hikes would not only hit the wealthy. It never works that way. There is no way to set up the kind of massive, never-ending new entitlements the Democrats want without coming hard—hard—after the middle class.

Oh, and, sure enough, nonpartisan experts have already confirmed the Democrats' reckless taxing-and-spending spree would hit the middle class and shatter President Biden's promise of no new taxes for anybody earning less than \$400,000 a year.

But as my colleague, the junior Senator from South Carolina, has put it,

as much as the reckless cost of their wish list would hurt Americans, the reckless content of the legislation may be even worse. Just look at what Democrats want to do to American families' healthcare and prescription medicines.

Last month, a new report from the Medicare trustees confirmed that the trust fund for Medicare Part A is on track to reach insolvency in just 5 years—5 years from now. More than 54 million American seniors rely on Medicare, and the promises we have already made are getting more and more expensive to keep.

Last year, for example, for the first time ever, the amount the Federal Government spent on Medicare alone exceeded everything that we spent on our national defense.

With Medicare 5 years from real fiscal problems, the last thing we need right now are politicians stretching the program even thinner, but that is exactly what Democrats are doing behind closed doors at this very moment.

Their reckless taxing-and-spending spree would heap hundreds of billions of dollars in new expenses and obligations onto the already troubled Medicare trust funds; hundreds of billions of dollars in new obligations for untested new programs, for big new pools of people, all using the care seniors count on as the Democrats' piggyback, with the program already on unsure footing.

Even some of our colleagues on the Democratic side are calling this craziness what it is. As one of our colleagues said recently, we have to "stabiliz[e] what we have, before we start going down this expensive [road]" or else it would be "fiscal insanity."

But that isn't the only damage the Democrats' bill would inflict on our health system. At the same time, they want to impose socialist price controls on the prescription medicines that Americans need. This is another example of magical thinking: If we just pass a law saying something ought to be cheaper, it will be cheaper.

But here in the real world, arbitrary price-setting on prescription drugs would cut down the private sector's incentive to keep innovating. Expert research shows Americans and the whole world would be left with fewer new drugs, fewer new treatments, and fewer new cures.

Mr. President, this isn't an abstract thing. This is a human cost. In the world Democrats want to create, some Americans would get sick and some would die who would have lived if new treatments had come into existence instead of being squashed—squashed—by bad policy.

One University of Chicago academic and past leader of the Council of Economic Advisers has calculated that over one decade, House Democrats' prescription price controls could rob our Nation of 15 to 20 times as many collective years of life as the entire COVID pandemic has stolen so far.

Let me say that again. This expert believes that the Democratic war on

prescription drug innovation could result in a total loss of American life that is 15 to 20 times that which COVID has caused thus far.

In a serious world, any discussion of this terrible policy would stop right there. But Democrats need to slash our investment in treatments and cures because they need to cannibalize that money for other parts of their partisan wish list.

It is the same reason Democrats are clinging to their absurd, new IRS spying provision that would let Big Brother snoop on citizens' transactions in excess of \$600—another perfectly awful idea, but they need the money.

These desperate cash grabs capture the essence of this partisan bill the Democrats are drafting behind closed doors—jeopardizing seniors' Medicare funding, killing huge numbers of Americans indirectly by attacking new treatments and new cures.

And for what?

For a liberal hodgepodge of new entitlement programs when we can't even shore up the ones we already have. It is just a few more of the hundred ways this reckless taxing-and-spending spree would hurt the families of America.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Ms. WARREN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PADILLA). Without objection, it is so ordered.

ANTI-CORRUPTION AND PUBLIC INTEGRITY ACT

Ms. WARREN. Mr. President, I rise today to express concern about a culture of corruption among top officials at the Federal Reserve.

Officials at the Federal Reserve are entrusted to make decisions that affect the global economy and touch the lives of every person in our country. These officials have access to private information, often gathered at the expense and even by legislative mandate. There is no room for self-dealing by Federal officials. There is no room for even the appearance of self-dealing. Every member of the Federal Reserve should know that without a reminder from Congress. But, evidently, there is a problem at the Fed. We don't know the scope of the problem or how long it has been going on, but a very disturbing picture is emerging.

Last month, it was discovered that, during the economic turmoil of 2020, as the Fed was called on to take extraordinary measures to support our economy, Robert Kaplan, President of the Federal Reserve Bank of Dallas, made multiple million-dollar-plus stock trades.

It was also disclosed that, in the same period, Eric Rosengren, President of the Federal Reserve Bank of Boston, made multiple purchases and sales related to his stakes in real estate investment trusts and other securities.

A new report last week revealed that a third key Fed official, Vice Chair Richard Clarida, also traded between \$1 million and \$5 million out of a bond fund into stock funds exactly 1 day before Fed Chair Powell publicly suggested possible policy actions that would significantly affect bonds and stocks.

The Federal Reserve makes hugely consequential decisions—decisions involving interest rates, trillions of dollars' worth of lending and debt, and the regulation and supervision of the banking and financial systems. The year 2020 was particularly consequential, with the Fed taking unprecedented steps to backstop financial markets in response to the pandemic. To make these specific decisions, Fed officials needed access to vast quantities of proprietary, nonpublic data and information about individual firms, the state of the economy, and upcoming Fed actions. Under these circumstances, for Fed officials to actively trade in the market raises legitimate questions about conflicts of interest and insider trading.

These Fed officials' actions show, at a minimum, very bad judgment. They also suggest that some Fed officials believe that building up their own personal wealth is more important than strengthening the American people's confidence in the Fed.

In his years as Chair of the Fed, it is not clear why Mr. Powell did not take steps to prevent these activities. Surely, he understands that this kind of behavior by Fed officials corrodes the public trust in the Fed and that, in turn, such corrosion undermines the effectiveness of the Fed.

Surely, he understands that the Fed officials' trades run afoul of Agency guidelines, which state Fed officials should "avoid any dealings or other conduct that might convey even an appearance of conflict between their personal interests, the interests of the [Federal Reserve] System, and the public interest."

Surely, he knows that, according to the Fed's policies, its officials "have a special responsibility for maintaining the integrity, dignity, and reputation of the System. Accordingly, they should scrupulously avoid conduct that might in any way tend to embarrass the System."

Surely he is aware that the Fed's policies instruct officials to "carefully adhere to the spirit, as well as the letter, of the rules of ethical conduct," and to "exemplify in their own conduct the high standards set forth in those rules."

As the sitting chair of the Federal Reserve, the responsibility to safeguard the integrity of the Federal Reserve rests squarely with him. Setting the right culture at the Fed and making sure safeguards are in place to prevent self-dealing and to protect the public's confidence should be the minimum standard any Federal Reserve Chair should meet. And once there is a

problem, a quick and aggressive response is critical. Chair Powell has failed at both tasks.

Last week, I said that I would not support Chair Powell's renomination because in one decision after another, he has consistently failed to serve as an effective financial regulator. But that is not his only failure.

Chair Powell has also failed as a leader. Our Nation needs leaders who are willing to set aside and enforce strong ethics standards and who act swiftly when a problem arises.

Our Nation does not need a go-along-to-get-along leader who doesn't know or doesn't care when, on his watch, people with great responsibility advance their own interests over the interests of our Nation, or someone who drags his feet in dealing with problems that shake the public's confidence in the institution he leads.

We need changes at the Fed. I have already called on key Fed officials to voluntarily abide by stricter ethics standards. Yesterday, I asked the SEC to investigate these trades to determine whether these Fed officials may have broken laws on insider trading, and I will continue to push Chair Powell to vigorously enforce the ethics standards that already exist and to put stronger ethics standards in place at the Fed.

In the last Congress, I introduced sweeping ethics legislation, the Anti-Corruption and Public Integrity Act. This legislation would ban all individual stock ownership by Members of Congress, by Cabinet Secretaries, by senior congressional staff, by Federal judges, by White House staff, and by other Agency officials while in office.

It would prohibit all government officials from holding or trading stock if its value might be influenced by their Agency, their department, or their actions. And it would require senior government officials and White House staff to divest from privately owned assets that would present conflicts of interest. This far-reaching legislation would also tighten conflict of interest and recusal requirements and shut the revolving door between industry and government.

Now, look, this proposal won't solve every problem. And for any officials who have engaged in illegal insider trading, we don't need a new law to hold them accountable. But the proposal would dramatically reduce the possibility for any appearance of impropriety at the Fed and at every other Federal Agency and in Congress and in the White House.

I urge Congress to pass this legislation and to restore Americans' trust in our elected leaders and the officials who make key decisions—key decisions not only about the economy, but about public health, the environment, and every other aspect of government.

There is a lot of housekeeping we need to do, and the faster we start, the faster we get it done.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Republican whip.

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be able to complete my remarks and that Senator BURR also be able to complete his remarks before the vote starts.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RURAL AMERICA

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, there are a few, quote-unquote, winners under Democrats' \$3½ trillion tax-and-spending spree—unions, for example, and electric vehicle manufacturers.

But there are a lot more losers, like middle-class families, who have to stretch their paychecks to cover higher inflation and higher energy bills; workers, who will see jobs and opportunities shrink; and farmers and ranchers.

Agriculture is the lifeblood of my home State of South Dakota, and so ag issues are pretty much always on my mind. And I am deeply concerned by what Democrats' tax-and-spending spree will mean for South Dakota farmers.

For starters, I am worried that the Democrats' bill could mean the end of some farms, thanks to the bill's expansion of the death tax.

Now, I have long crusaded against the death tax. Death should not be a taxable event, and there should be limits on how many times the government can tax the same money over and over and over.

But I get particularly fired up when talking about the death tax when it comes to farmers and ranchers, because the death tax can threaten the existence of family farms and ranches.

You ask why.

Because farming and ranching are often cash-poor operations. Farmers' and ranchers' money is tied up in their land, not the bank. So a farmer could have land worth as much as several million dollars and still struggle to break even in years where the harvest has been poor.

So when that same farmer dies, the IRS will come in, demanding a substantial portion of his or her estate. But since most of that money is tied up in the land, there is a good chance that the family will not have enough money in the bank to pay the IRS, and so they will have to start selling off the land—the lifeblood of their farming operation.

So give that a couple of generations and the death tax can drive a family farm right out of existence.

I am proud that the tax reform bill we passed in 2017 included death tax relief. We successfully doubled the estate tax exemption, which lifted the specter of the death tax for most farmers and ranchers and helped reduce the need for costly estate planning efforts to try to keep the farm or ranch in the family.

Unfortunately—unfortunately—we were not able to make this relief permanent, which is why I have continued to push for eliminating the death tax. But at least family farms and ranches

were set to have relief through the year 2025.

Well, not anymore. Democrats are set to return the death tax exemption to its pre-2017 level starting in January, which means that more family farms and ranches will once again be in the tax's crosshairs.

As I said, death should not be a taxable event. The IRS should not be coming in to see you at the same time as the undertaker. But the government—and the government, I should say, should not be in the business of shuttering family farms and family businesses.

But thanks to Democrats' tax-and-spending spree, a lot of farmers are going to have to start worrying about whether they will be able to hand their farm on to their children or whether a government tax bill will mean the end of an enterprise the family has cultivated, literally, for generations.

The icing on the cake, of course, is that at the same time Democrats are planning to expand a tax that threatens family farms, they are also planning to include tax relief for their millionaire contributors in blue States.

That is right. Despite the fact that Democrats are scrambling for money to fund some of their spending spree, they are preparing to provide tax relief for wealthy Democrat donors.

I am disturbed by the fact that Democrats are willing to jeopardize family farms and ranches to help fund their spending spree. But I am not all that surprised because it is clear from the bill that farmers and ranchers are not high on Democrats' priority list.

The bill's spending on rail, for example, emphasizes passenger rail, which will benefit Amtrak and a handful of east coast cities, but it means little to most Americans.

The rail that matters to Americans in the heartland is freight rail, particularly short line railroads, which carry farmers' and ranchers' corn and wheat and beef to markets around the United States. But short line rail gets short shrift in this bill.

Biofuels also get short shrift. As this bill makes clear, Democrats have picked their preferred winner in the clean energy stakes, and that winner is electric vehicles. Biofuels take a back seat in Democrats' legislation despite the essential role they played in making American energy cleaner and despite the significance of biofuels to the rural economy.

Every few years, Congress passes a major farm bill. For decades, that legislation has been the product of bipartisan collaboration and a lengthy hearing and fact-finding process that allows for extensive input from farmers and ranchers and other ag stakeholders. It is one of the last, I would say, truly bipartisan things that we regularly do around here.

But Democrats have decided to use their tax-and-spending spree to circumvent the bipartisan farm bill process. Democrats are extending farm pro-

grams without bipartisan input and without real involvement from many in the agricultural community. And, of course, they are not expanding all farm bill programs.

They are not, for example, extending or providing money for the farm safety net. Instead, they are targeting money at programs that they feel will allow them to advance their climate agenda.

Farmers are not Democrats' main interest when it comes to the agricultural provisions in this bill. Democrats' climate agenda is the priority.

If I am not here in Washington for Senate business, I can usually be found back home in South Dakota, where I spend a lot of time talking to farmers and ranchers. Most of them haven't shown a lot of interest in tax breaks for union dues or electric vehicle tax credits. But I have heard from a lot of farmers and ranchers who are worried the Democrats' proposed tax policies may threaten their livelihood. And, unfortunately, they are right to be worried.

Speaker PELOSI suggested that this tax-and-spending spree was about Democrats' values, but based on what we have seen, I am not too sure those values align with those of rural Americans. Democrats' tax-and-spending spree is a bad deal for rural America and for working families around the country, and I will continue to do everything I can to protect Americans from the dangers of Democrats' socialist fantasies.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Carolina.

TRIBUTE TO VANESSA J. LE

Mr. BURR. Mr. President, I rise today to pay tribute to Vanessa Le, a dedicated member of the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence staff, an integral part of the committee's investigation into Russia's interference in the 2016 U.S. elections, and my designee on the committee staff since March of 2019. While with the committee, Vanessa proved herself time and again to be more than just another capable lawyer. Although there is no debating her strengths as an attorney, it is—and I hope always will be—Vanessa's courage in the face of corruption and expedience that distinguishes her counsel. As an unrelenting advocate for virtue, sensibility, and the common good, Vanessa lives the axiom, "What is right is not always popular, and what is popular is not always right."

Vanessa's work for the committee covered a waterfront of complex national security challenges that ranged from investigating Russia's election interference to conducting oversight of the U.S. counterintelligence apparatus. As lead investigative counsel for the majority on the Russia investigation, Vanessa worked tirelessly to secure witness interviews and document production, draft and serve committee subpoenas, interview witnesses, and liaise with the Department of Justice,

the Office of Special Counsel, and the Senate legal counsel. In addition, she helped conduct witness interviews, drafted and reviewed chapters of the committee's report, and provided crucial legal advice on the committee's constitutional and Senate procedural authorities.

Vanessa was also responsible for overseeing the FBI and helping to actualize my policy objectives relative to the Bureau and the Nation's broader counterintelligence enterprise. Vanessa brought a keen mind, exacting questions, and a heartfelt passion for the role of the committee in keeping this Nation secure to work with her every day.

Vanessa's professional experience prior to joining the committee staff includes time as a litigation associate at the Drinker, Biddle & Reath law firm branch in Chicago, and as an Honors Attorney in the National Security Agency's Office of General Counsel. Vanessa is leaving the committee staff to work for the Office of the Director of National Intelligence, where she will serve as a special advisor to the DNI. I can most assuredly say that our loss is Director Haines' gain. Vanessa will achieve incredible things at the ODNI, and it is to the country's benefit that her contributions to work with this intelligence community will continue. Although I am hopeful the transition will afford her more time with her husband Gary and son George and baby girl Margaux, anyone who has ever met Vanessa will tell you that she is not really the relax-at-home type. I suspect she will bring the same intensity and "let's get this done" attitude that she was known for on the committee into her role at the DNI.

Therefore, it is with a little reluctance and a lot of pride that I wish Vanessa well and thank her for all she has done for the committee. Her wit, intellect, boundless energy, and unparalleled mastery of the culinary arts will be impossible to replace.

Thank you, Vanessa. The vital investigative work of this committee would not have been accomplished absent your dedication, your clear-minded judgment, and your unwavering moral compass.

TRIBUTE TO NATE ADLER AND NICK BASCIANO

Mr. President, I would be remiss, though, to close my comments about Vanessa's departure from the committee without also acknowledging the departure of two other dedicated staff members. Nate Adler and Nick Basciano, currently serving on the majority staff of the committee, are leaving the committee to pursue the next chapters in their professional lives.

Nick and Nate have been valuable members of the committee staff, working critical portfolios covering, among other things, counterintelligence, foreign influence, and Asia, as well as serving as budget monitors to intelligence Agencies. Their contributions to the committee and its work cannot be overstated, and much cannot be pub-

licly acknowledged. Their dedication to mission and their work ethic was a model for all, and their presence and counsel will be sorely missed.

I wish them and Vanessa all the best in their future endeavors. I know that they are going to do great things, and I look forward to hearing and reading about those future accomplishments.

I yield the floor.

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The bill clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Executive Calendar No. 336, Paloma Adams-Allen, of the District of Columbia, to be a Deputy Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development.

Charles E. Schumer, Robert Menendez, Patrick J. Leahy, Patty Murray, Maria Cantwell, Sheldon Whitehouse, Brian Schatz, Debbie Stabenow, Catherine Cortez Masto, Christopher A. Coons, Ron Wyden, Margaret Wood Hassan, Edward J. Markey, Benjamin L. Cardin, Richard J. Durbin, Tina Smith, Elizabeth Warren, Angus S. King, Jr.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the nomination of Paloma Adams-Allen, of the District of Columbia, to be a Deputy Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) is necessarily absent.

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 78, nays 21, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 404 Ex.]

YEAS—78

Baldwin	Hassan	Risch
Barrasso	Heinrich	Romney
Bennet	Hickenlooper	Rosen
Blumenthal	Hirono	Rounds
Blunt	Hoeven	Sanders
Booker	Inhofe	Sasse
Brown	Kaine	Schatz
Burr	Kelly	Schumer
Cantwell	King	Scott (SC)
Capito	Klobuchar	Shaheen
Cardin	Leahy	Sinema
Carper	Lujan	Smith
Casey	Manchin	Stabenow
Collins	Markey	Sullivan
Coons	McConnell	Tester
Cornyn	Menendez	Thune
Cortez Masto	Merkley	Tillis
Cramer	Moran	Toomey
Crapo	Murkowski	Van Hollen
Duckworth	Murphy	Warner
Durbin	Murray	Warnock
Fischer	Ossoff	Warren
Gillibrand	Padilla	Whitehouse
Graham	Peters	Wicker
Grassley	Portman	Wyden
Hagerty	Reed	Young

NAYS—21

Blackburn	Ernst	Lummis
Boozman	Hawley	Marshall
Braun	Hyde-Smith	Paul
Cassidy	Johnson	Rubio
Cotton	Kennedy	Scott (FL)
Cruz	Lankford	Shelby
Daines	Lee	Tuberville

NOT VOTING—1

Feinstein

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LUJAN). On this vote, the yeas are 78 and the nays are 21.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I and Senator HAGERTY be able to complete our remarks prior to the scheduled recess.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NOMINATION OF LAUREN J. KING

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I rise today in support of the nomination of Lauren King to serve as U.S. District Court judge for the Western District of Washington in the Seattle courthouse.

Ms. King is an immensely talented and experienced practitioner of the law, whom I had the honor of recommending to the President for this position, and I am proud to be advocating for her confirmation here today.

Ms. King currently chairs Foster Garvey's Native American Law Practice Group and has served as a pro tem appellate judge for the Northwest Intertribal Court System since 2013. She has served as a commissioner on the Washington State Gambling Commission and taught Federal Indian law at Seattle University School of Law.

Her qualifications are exemplary, and Ms. King's confirmation will also be a historic one. She is a citizen of the Muscogee Nation, and she would be the first-ever Native American Federal judge in the history of my home State of Washington.

Out of the 890 currently confirmed Federal judges, only 3 are Native American. Ms. King would become the fourth, and she would be the sixth-ever Native American judge in U.S. history.

While this number is still too low, Ms. King's confirmation will be an important step toward making sure the members of the Federal judiciary reflect the diversity of our Nation and have critical experience and insight into the unique relationship between our Federal Government and Native Tribes.

This is especially important in Washington State, which for those who don't know, is home to 29 federally recognized Indian Tribes.

So it is not just important but essential that our Federal judges understand the unique histories and perspectives of Native people and the legal principles that protect and preserve Native American standing under Federal law.

I believe this is a perspective that matters and one that has been missing for far too long. With her experience in the Northwest Intertribal Court System and representing Tribes in private practice, Ms. King has a deep understanding of these principles and the legal issues that Tribes in Washington State face. And she has the support of major Native voices in the space. She has been strongly endorsed by the National Native American Bar Association, the National Congress of American Indians, the Native American Rights Fund, and more.

She has earned the support by being a sharp legal mind and a fair and just arbiter of the law. I firmly believe Ms. King has the experience, knowledge, and perspective required to serve on our Federal judiciary with distinction.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting her nomination. We can confirm highly qualified judges, and we can make sure our Federal bench reflects the diversity of the people it serves.

And before I close, I also want to acknowledge the two historic U.S. attorneys for Washington State who were confirmed last week. Nick Brown, of Seattle, is the first Black U.S. attorney for the Western District of Washington, and Vanessa Waldref, of Spokane, is the first U.S. attorney for the Eastern District of Washington.

I know that both of these historic appointees have the experience needed to be successful, and I am confident they will work diligently to pursue justice for the people of my home State.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

INFRASTRUCTURE

Mr. HAGERTY. Mr. President, on August 7, I came to the Senate floor to oppose the expedited passage of what is known as the bipartisan infrastructure bill. I did that for several reasons, including because it was obviously going to be taken hostage and used by Democrats to impose Big Government socialism on America.

In those August 7 remarks, I said:

I am frustrated with this legislation . . . because it is tied to . . . the Democrats' real ambition, which is their multitrillion-dollar march to socialism that they will unveil right after this infrastructure legislation is passed.

Democrats have admitted this . . . is [their] plan.

They previewed phase 1 of this scheme in March, when they spent \$1.9 trillion in the name of COVID relief. Of course, 90 percent of it had nothing to do with COVID. It was really just a payoff to their most loyal political supporters. Sadly, it is now causing the highest inflation . . . in decades . . . [which] is a daily tax on every American who [is buying] goods and services.

I went on to lay out phase 2, the step-by-step plan some Democrats are using

to launch their Big Government socialism fantasy.

Step 1, I said, was to change the conversation to trillions. Make billions look small. Condition the Congress. Condition the media. Condition people.

That has happened.

Step 2, I said, was to tell everyone that the United States needs infrastructure.

That has happened too.

Step 3, I said, was to redefine the term "infrastructure" to include Big Government socialism programs. Really muddy it up so that no one could understand what they were actually talking about.

That has happened.

Step 4, I said, was that when more reasonable Democrats in the Senate balk at some of the more extensive or egregious items, promise them a two-track process: one for hard infrastructure and one for social programs. Confuse the situation even further.

That has happened.

Step 5, I said, was to negotiate as much of the Democrats' socialist wish list as possible into the infrastructure track. Then, put the rest of the wish list into the Big Government socialism wish list bill.

That also has happened.

Step 6, I said, was to pass the bipartisan infrastructure bill through the Senate as quickly as possible. The Trojan horse would then be through the gates.

Unfortunately, that has also happened.

Step 7, I said, was to hold that infrastructure bill hostage in the House of Representatives until everything they couldn't get into the infrastructure bill—meaning the trillions of dollars in Big Government spending programs—also passes the Senate.

That is what we are seeing happening right now, just as I predicted in early August.

Step 8, I said, was for the President to say that he wouldn't sign the infrastructure bill into law if it is not accompanied by trillions of dollars in Big Government socialism programs.

This has also happened.

Step 9, I said, was to get the Big Government socialism part passed by circumventing the filibuster in the Senate. This would require abusing an arcane loophole called reconciliation to pass trillions of dollars in Big Government socialism with only 50 Democrat votes.

Step 10, I said, was to give more moderate Democrats political cover to support the parliamentary trick and Big Government socialism spending. To accomplish this, radical Democrats in the House are threatening to shoot the hostage—the hostage is the infrastructure bill that passed the Senate—a bill that more moderate Democrats more strongly support.

These final two steps have not yet been executed because some Democrats see the peril in following the dangerous instincts of the most extreme elements of their party.

On September 27, the most radical House Democrats, backed by Speaker PELOSI, stated that they were "committed to voting for the infrastructure bill only after [their Big Government socialism bill] is passed."

On September 29, one of the most outspoken of that group made it even clearer, saying:

[S]everal months ago, we had an agreement with . . . everybody else throughout the entire party . . . we will move forward on this \$3.5 trillion. And we will link the [two bills, meaning the bipartisan infrastructure bill] and the [big government socialism bill].

In revealing this, she confirmed that the far left has been manipulating everyone involved in this process.

When I laid out Democrats' plans on the Senate floor back in August, I used the word "abracadabra" to illustrate the sleight of hand Democrats were attempting to pull off, saying that the American people might not even notice—until it is too late—that their wallet has been stolen and their country has been fundamentally changed.

Fortunately, it seems the American people are wising up to the trick. The question I asked at the time—and the question the American people should be thinking about—is this: If all of these policies and all of the spending is so good, why does getting it done require a parliamentary house of mirrors?

The answer to this question is that many Democrats know that the Big Government socialism bill is unpopular; it is bad for the country. Otherwise, the hostage-taking wouldn't be necessary.

This radical dream of Big Government socialism is stalled out at the moment. So, at Speaker PELOSI's direction, President Biden drove up to Capitol Hill on October 1 and, according to one Representative, told House Democrats that in order to get the infrastructure bill done, we have to get this agreement on the Big Government socialism bill through the reconciliation.

According to a House Democrat, the President said that he wanted "both bills to go at the same time" and specifically praised the far-left House Members who were "exuberant," according to a progressive congressional caucus member.

In other words, the far left is in charge, and President Biden embraces that fact. His actions made clear that the infrastructure bill is merely a tool to pass this Big Government socialism legislation. Both must pass or neither will pass. Rather than use his platform to defuse the hostage situation, President Biden is egging on the hostage-taking, and he is demanding Big Government socialism as the ransom.

Following President Biden's meeting with House Democrats, POLITICO quoted a Democratic observer who said:

The fact that the president came to the Hill and whipped against his own bill is the strangest thing I've ever seen.

It is very strange indeed, but it underscores the sad reality that the far left is in charge of the Democratic Party.

What we have witnessed these past 9 months is the biggest bait-and-switch in American political history. The American people didn't vote for Big Government socialism in 2020. Yet the Biden administration proudly proclaims that it is the most radically leftwing administration in American history.

According to POLITICO this morning, President Biden held a call with progressive House Members yesterday in which he told them that he was "getting more and more frustrated with moderate Democrats." For what? For refusing to be steamrolled by an agenda that most Americans don't want?

Democrats' extreme politics are eclipsed only by their incompetence, from Afghanistan to inflation, from our energy dependence to a border collapse. Why? Because far-left radicals are dictating the agenda, and they are calling all the shots.

With respect to this infrastructure hostage situation, the only question now is, Will every Democrat pay the ransom of Big Government socialism? And what is included in this ransom?

First, Democrats are currently haggling over the top-line cost. Will it be \$3.5 trillion, \$2.5 trillion, \$1.5 trillion, or something in between? Again, this is trillions of dollars—with a "t"—that we are talking about.

The number that they use is actually irrelevant because the bill will actually cost far more when you peel away the budget gimmicks. The overall cost of the bill is only labeled at \$3.5 trillion because Democrats are pretending—again, for budget projection purposes—that many of these costly programs are simply temporary and they will terminate in a few years.

Ask any Democrat whether this bill just includes some temporary spending—spending that will soon phase out. Ask them this: How will they vote when it comes time to prevent the program from expiring? You know this. Once you turn this sort of spending on, it will be next to impossible to turn it off.

This is like valuing the cost of your home at the initial downpayment price and ignoring the 30-year mortgage that follows.

Current estimates are that \$3.5 trillion really will be more like \$5.5 trillion, and that is just in the first decade alone. Yet all of Washington is currently obsessed with negotiations over where this phony number is going to land. This is another distraction. It is a tactic to divert your eyes from what is in the bill. No matter what number is used, the total cost of this bill is vastly higher than they claim, tens of trillions of dollars over my children's and your children's lifetime. That is before even accounting for inevitable cost overruns, waste, and program ex-

pansions. Of course, this means most of the Big Government socialism bill will be debt-financed because the bill will cost far more than projected even in the short run.

Given our current debt of nearly \$30 trillion, allowing the fuse to continue to burn on this new, inflation-fueling, economy-crushing level of debt borders on insanity. It is the kind of thing that toppled world powers in the past.

Now is the time to get our fiscal house in order or at least avoid making it worse. Democrats want to solve the problem of a burning house not by throwing water on it but by throwing on gasoline and arguing that 50 gallons of gasoline is, well, better than throwing 100 gallons of gasoline on it.

As obscene as Democrats' spending has become, focusing on cost obscures the more insidious, destructive nature of Big Government socialism.

Without careful oversight from the American people and their elected Representatives here in Congress, government bureaucracy can't help but serve its own interests. Over time, the bureaucracy has fed itself, becoming ever more powerful, ever more hungry, and ever more present in the lives of the American people.

Many Democrats believe in feeding the bureaucratic beast. They want the government to grow, and they want Americans to be ever more dependent upon government from cradle to grave. They want permanent government control over childcare, over preschool, raising your children, over healthcare, over energy, jobs, employers, and the list goes on. This will mean that Americans must turn to Big Government for more and more of life's necessities.

Big Government will increasingly control the lives of Americans beginning in their formative years. Once the Federal Government is in charge of funding preschool and daycare that has crowded out all the private competition, you better believe the Federal Government will be providing the lesson plans for your children as well.

This legislation will dramatically expand the welfare entitlement state, meaning they will provide even more incentives for American workers not to work. At a time when small businesses are desperately searching for workers, this is the wrong thing to do. It will fuel inflation; it will pile on more debt for our children and grandchildren; and it will drastically increase taxes and regulations on all Americans. More fundamentally and more sadly, it will move America closer to a European socialist model where government dependency replaces opportunity and where the dignity of work is lost.

The strength of America is our unique system—our spirit, our work ethic, and our compassion for one another. The foundation for all this has been the freedom to pursue our dreams thanks to the system of free market capitalism—a system that has spread the American dream across the globe. That dream spread because our country offered something different.

This plan to spend tens of trillions of dollars fundamentally threatens the American system and the American dream, not only by jeopardizing our fiscal stability but by ushering in Big Government socialism, which, if history is any guide, tends to crowd out everything else and, perhaps, especially opportunity.

The American people have proven that they will flourish if permitted to do so. In this sense, the only thing that can stop the American people is the size and the reach of the American Government. For the Senate to participate in imposing such self-inflicted wounds on our country would be profoundly sad. History will not look kindly upon it.

However, one point from my remarks this summer remains just as true today:

It only takes one Democrat to end this insanity, to stand up and say he or she won't participate in this scheme.

The American people and their children and grandchildren will no doubt be grateful if one of them chooses to do so.

I yield the floor.

RECESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands in recess until 2:15 p.m.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 12:38 p.m., recessed until 2:15 p.m. and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Ms. SINEMA).

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR—Continued

NOMINATION OF PALOMA ADAMS-ALLEN

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, I rise today to express my support for the nomination of Paloma Adams-Allen to be Deputy Administrator for Management and Resources for the United States Agency for International Development, USAID.

Ms. Adams-Allen is a dedicated public servant who has spent her entire career focusing on international development and eliminating global poverty. She will bring with her essential leadership experience, stemming from her years as USAID's Deputy Assistant Administrator for the Latin America and Caribbean Bureau and, most recently, as the CEO of the Inter-American Foundation.

She is exactly the type of leader USAID needs right now as Administrator Samantha Power aims to restore and refocus the Agency as a critical arm of U.S. foreign policy.

The Senate Foreign Relations Committee reported Ms. Adam-Allen's nomination by voice vote, with no Members asking to be recorded in opposition. Yet she has been languishing on the Senate floor for more than 2 months due to Republican holds. Even though the Biden administration has been in office for more than 9 months, the Senate is only now getting around

to voting on just the second nominee to USAID.

Last week, I made a live unanimous consent request to confirm Ms. Adams-Allen and nine other nominees the Senate Foreign Relations Committee reported to the floor, including two other USAID nominees. But each of the nominations was blocked by our Republican colleagues for reasons that have nothing to do with the nominations themselves.

This continued obstruction of nominees who are critical to restoring U.S. global leadership and ensuring our national security is shameful. And it is dangerous.

USAID is grappling with the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic and other humanitarian emergencies that are ravaging the globe, and Members of this body are preventing it from effectively carrying out its mission, a mission that is intended to further U.S. interests.

So while I am relieved that the full Senate is finally taking steps to confirm Ms. Adams-Allen, the fact that we need votes on both cloture and final passage on a nominee who is without a hint of controversy, has served dutifully in government for decades, and was reported with unanimous support from the Foreign Relations Committee, is utterly absurd.

The delays and obstacles facing nominees for critical development and national security posts pending on the Senate floor and in the Senate Foreign Relations Committee is reckless and contrary to our country's interests. We owe it to the Senate and the American people to fix this problem.

I strongly support confirming Ms. Adams-Allen and respectfully urge my colleagues to join me in advancing her nomination, along with all of the foreign affairs nominations pending before this body.

I yield the floor.

VOTE ON ADAMS-ALLEN NOMINATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, all postcloture time has expired.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Adams-Allen nomination?

Mr. CASEY. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) is necessarily absent.

The result was announced—yeas 79, nays 20, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 405 Ex.]

YEAS—79

Baldwin	Blunt	Burr
Barrasso	Booker	Cantwell
Bennet	Boozman	Capito
Blumenthal	Brown	Cardin

Carper	King	Sasse
Casey	Klobuchar	Schatz
Collins	Leahy	Schumer
Coons	Lujan	Scott (SC)
Cornyn	Manchin	Shaheen
Cortez Masto	Markey	Sinema
Cramer	McConnell	Smith
Crapo	Menendez	Stabenow
Duckworth	Merkley	Sullivan
Durbin	Moran	Tester
Fischer	Murkowski	Thune
Gillibrand	Murphy	Tillis
Graham	Murray	Toomey
Grassley	Ossoff	Van Hollen
Hagerty	Padilla	Warner
Hassan	Peters	Warnock
Heinrich	Portman	Warren
Hickenlooper	Reed	Whitehouse
Hirono	Risch	Wicker
Hoeven	Romney	Wyden
Inhofe	Rosen	Young
Kaine	Rounds	
Kelly	Sanders	

NAYS—20

Blackburn	Hawley	Marshall
Braun	Hyde-Smith	Paul
Cassidy	Johnson	Rubio
Cotton	Kennedy	Scott (FL)
Cruz	Lankford	Shelby
Daines	Lee	Tuberville
Ernst	Lummis	

NOT VOTING—1

Feinstein

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the motion to reconsider is considered made and laid upon the table, and the President will be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Executive Calendar No. 253, Lauren J. King, of Washington, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of Washington.

Richard J. Durbin, Charles E. Schumer, Christopher Murphy, Amy Klobuchar, Debbie Stabenow, Martin Heinrich, Edward J. Markey, Patty Murray, Tina Smith, Tammy Baldwin, Sheldon Whitehouse, Brian Schatz, Tim Kaine, Alex Padilla, Tammy Duckworth, Richard Blumenthal, Jacky Rosen.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the nomination of Lauren J. King, of Washington, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of Washington, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) is necessarily absent.

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 55, nays 44, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 406 Ex.]

YEAS—55

Baldwin	Hickenlooper	Reed
Bennet	Hirono	Rosen
Blumenthal	Kaine	Rounds
Booker	Kelly	Sanders
Brown	King	Schatz
Cantwell	Klobuchar	Schumer
Cardin	Leahy	Shaheen
Carper	Lujan	Sinema
Casey	Manchin	Smith
Collins	Markey	Stabenow
Coons	McConnell	Tester
Cortez Masto	Menendez	Van Hollen
Duckworth	Merkley	Warner
Durbin	Murkowski	Warnock
Gillibrand	Murphy	Warren
Graham	Murray	Whitehouse
Grassley	Ossoff	Wyden
Hassan	Padilla	
Heinrich	Peters	

NAYS—44

Barrasso	Fischer	Risch
Blackburn	Hagerty	Romney
Blunt	Hawley	Rubio
Boozman	Hoeven	Sasse
Braun	Hyde-Smith	Scott (FL)
Burr	Inhofe	Scott (SC)
Capito	Johnson	Shelby
Cassidy	Kennedy	Sullivan
Cornyn	Lankford	Thune
Cotton	Lee	Tillis
Cramer	Lummis	Toomey
Crapo	Marshall	Tuberville
Cruz	Moran	Wicker
Daines	Paul	Young
Ernst	Portman	

NOT VOTING—1

Feinstein

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 55, the nays are 44.

The motion was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The senior assistant bill clerk read the nomination of Lauren J. King, of Washington, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of Washington.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

(The remarks of Mr. LEAHY, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. WARNOCK, and Mr. LUJÁN pertaining to the introduction of S. 4 are printed in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MURPHY). The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mrs. CAPITO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

INFRASTRUCTURE AND JOBS ACT

Mrs. CAPITO. Mr. President, this summer, the Senate passed historic bipartisan legislation that would make meaningful investments in our physical infrastructure. We did the hard work. We did the hard work to produce legislation that meets current and future needs by investing in our roads,

our bridges, clean water, broadband, transit systems, rail, and our electric grid.

Chairman CARPER and I led a surface transportation reauthorization bill and a water infrastructure bill in our EPW Committee, both of which were unanimously reported out by our committee and really served as the backbone of this infrastructure package. The Commerce Committee and the Energy and Natural Resources Committee both also contributed bipartisan bills to this major effort. A bipartisan group of our colleagues, led by Senator PORTMAN and Senator SINEMA, negotiated with the Biden administration to complete the package. That effort resulted in the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act, which earned the vote of 69 Senators nearly 2 months ago. President Biden himself expressed his support for the legislation in a widely covered speech from the White House.

By now, that bill should be law and Federal funding should be on the way to State Departments of Transportation, local water boards, and our economic development officials. All Speaker PELOSI had to do was put the Senate legislation on the floor in August and watch its passage with a strong bipartisan vote. However, House Democrats broke promises to their own Members and refused to ask for a vote on the bill, and that was in September. Our bipartisan work in the Senate advanced the infrastructure football to the 1-yard line. We were there, but somehow House Democrats were still unable to reach the goal line.

Last Friday, our Federal Surface Transportation Program lapsed—lapsed—for the first time in over a decade. After months of talking about rebuilding American infrastructure, House Democrats shut down the Federal Highway Administration, pressing pause on some of the most important infrastructure programs in this country. It was a short lapse, but it was a lapse. A lapse in these programs would be unacceptable in any circumstance, but House Democrats decided to let the programs expire rather than vote on bipartisan legislation that sat on their desks for more than 7 weeks during their August recess.

In delaying this vote, those leaders didn't just break their commitment to the American people, but, again, they broke a commitment to their own Members when they said—they were originally promised the infrastructure bill would receive a vote by September 27. Instead, the House and Senate had to reauthorize, quickly, our existing Surface Transportation Program, but guess what—for a month—October 31. What does that do? Not much. It does continue, but it does create confusion, and that stop-and-start is difficult. I appreciate my colleagues' work to reopen these programs, but it is not enough.

Over on the House side, they are holding core infrastructure legislation hostage in an effort to force Members

of their own party to come on board in separate legislation that would, in my opinion, waste \$3.5 trillion on social programs unrelated to infrastructure. The \$3.5 trillion package is what my colleague and our colleague, Senator MANCHIN, correctly described as “fiscal insanity.” House Democrats are telling the American people that if they want roads and bridges, they have to accept trillions of dollars in unrelated spending and unrelated tax policies.

If this reckless tax-and-spending spree were popular with the American people, they wouldn't have to bind it to the infrastructure legislation and block that legislation in an effort to convince the Members of their own party to support it, but they understand there is a real concern back home to spending \$3.5 trillion. I heard this over and over when I was just home over the weekend—over and over—from my constituents in West Virginia.

We all know inflation is real, and it is impacting day-to-day families—families who are trying to figure out how to pay for the cost of gasoline, that gallon of milk, those new school clothes, books, pencils, the cost of heating and cooling their homes. It is hurting our American families. And yet, even with these red flags, the Biden administration and my Democrat colleagues want to spend an additional 3.5 trillion—with a “t”—dollars. And if that is not enough, they want to impose the largest tax hike in decades.

These efforts will hit American families with higher prices and greater tax burdens at a time when they can least afford it. I am not sure there is a time we could ever afford it. So this makes zero sense.

Now, I know President Biden has promised not to raise taxes on families making less than \$400,000 a year. He has repeated this many, many times in his public speeches. But what he is not telling you is that the cost of everyday living is going up significantly because of these—and will go up more because of these progressive policies, which are a hidden tax on the American people. Your utility bills, your grocery bills, all the costs of everyday goods and services are going to go up.

And have you heard this just really outrageous idea that they want your bank or credit union to tell the IRS every deposit or withdrawal of \$600 or more? And if you have \$600 in your bank account, they want your bank or credit union to report that to the IRS. Does that sound like it is designed to target billionaires or middle-class Americans?

The taxes, fees, and penalties this partisan, reckless tax-and-spending package includes ultimately still falls to you, regardless of how much you make. As ranking member of the EPW Committee, I am especially concerned about several environmental provisions in the \$3.5 trillion spending plan.

Let's be clear. All of us, Republicans and Democrats, we do want a cleaner

energy future, and we are moving toward that. The proof of that is our work together on technologies like carbon capture and utilization. But this rushed reconciliation package doesn't allow time for any sort of transition. Wind and solar energy still has serious gaps. They are growing, yes, but they still have serious gaps in reliability and stability. When the wind stops blowing and the Sun isn't shining, our country still relies heavily on coal, natural gas, and nuclear. But instead of recognizing this reality and investing in technologies to accelerate carbon capture, which would lead to less emissions, this package punishes companies that are already cutting their emissions. It is reckless spending. It is punitive taxation, and, ultimately, the American family will pay the price.

Take, for example, the proposed methane tax—well, methane fee, it is called, but it is actually a natural gas tax. This regressive tax on natural gas would increase energy costs on American families and small businesses, disproportionately affecting middle- and low-income households at a time when natural gas prices are going up due to inflation and increased demand and reduced supply here and abroad due to some factors—and, right now, the pandemic.

According to the EPA, natural gas systems in the United States reduced their overall methane emissions by nearly 16 percent between 1990 and 2019, without these onerous regulations and taxes. It is widely recognized that the shale gas boom led to significant greenhouse gas emission reductions across our power sector. In fact, as our natural gas production has risen and has gone up, the country's overall greenhouse gas emissions have gone down significantly.

According to API, the methane fee, or tax, would cost approximately \$9.1 billion and as many as 90,000 jobs in a lot of the regions in the country, one of which is my own in West Virginia. Don't be fooled. Like any other part of this package, the methane fee is rushed government overreach when the market is already reducing emissions.

More than 150 groups have written to Congress to oppose this natural gas tax. This is not about reducing emissions or even raising revenues for Washington; it is about targeting an industry, oil and gas, and the related good-paying jobs, like those in West Virginia, for elimination for wholly political purposes. The idea that our country will be able to transition to a cleaner future and keep up with our energy demands without natural gas is just not based in reality.

So speaking of based in reality, let's talk about the proposed Clean Electricity Performance Program. This is a program in the \$3.5 trillion bill to eliminate coal and natural gas from our electricity mix by requiring an 80-percent reduction in carbon emissions from utilities by 2030. This goal is very unrealistic as fossil fuels now provide

60 percent of our Nation's electricity today, 2021.

The United Mine Workers of America wrote that this plan would "eliminate virtually all of West Virginia's coal generation fleet of eight baseload power plants well before the end of this decade. . . . All related coal mining and utility jobs would be lost, with severe [adverse] impacts on families, communities, and the local and state tax revenues associated with mining, electric generation, and electric power [generation]."

This program is an explicit attempt to put energy producers out of work. It would use taxpayer dollars to get rid of coal and natural gas jobs in States like mine, using a convoluted system to try to mask the hit to our electricity taxpayers. And for all the promises we heard of lined-up green energy jobs for these workers to replace these jobs, I am certainly not seeing many of those in my State, certainly not the tens of thousands of jobs that would be needed to make up for the lost jobs. And I am definitely not seeing any of those green jobs pay—the pay on those green jobs even close to what a miner would make or somebody in the natural gas business.

But the Clean Electricity Performance Program will impact more than just my home State, of course. If California is any indication, the clean electricity payment plan will lead to less reliability, rolling blackouts all across the country, and higher energy prices. We don't need to wait and see how a plan like this will impact a powerhouse country like ours.

Germany is already trying this. According to Forbes Magazine, our German friends are spending as much as \$4 trillion to install as much wind and solar capacity as possible—laudable goal—and to drastically curtail and hopefully eliminate the need for coal, natural gas, and nuclear. This has left Germany with the highest electricity prices in the world—harming their households and their world-famous manufacturing sector. When they have found themselves short of supply, they have to import coal-fired electricity from Poland.

We, here, in this country, would have no kind of international fallback. So while we try to mimic a path similar to Germany and shut down American coal mines, meanwhile China is building new coal plants that will wash out any of our supposed carbon reductions. American energy prices will skyrocket, and the Clean Energy Payment Plan will make a negligible impact on global emissions.

The Greenhouse Gas Reduction Fund is another absurd provision in this reconciliation package. This is basically a \$27.5 billion slush fund for Democrat States to use whatever they would use for their so-called green projects. This will increase our reliance on critical minerals and energy supplies that we get from China and other international competitors trying to put forward en-

ergy-free technologies and particularly looking at the production of lithium batteries and solar energy that is primarily produced in China.

Another egregious provision tucked away in this reconciliation package is a \$50 million expenditure to EPA to write new clean air regs. That is right, \$50 million. They would give \$50 million to write a new version of President Obama's Clean Power Plan and other devastating climate regulations. With the money, EPA will hire extra lawyers and bureaucrats to write additional regulations under section 111 and other provisions of the Clean Air Act in ways that they have never done before, all, in my view, which would put my hard-working West Virginians out of a job.

These are just a few of the environmental provisions in this reckless tax-and-spending spree. But the package is much broader than that. It is a wish list rolled into a \$3.5 trillion bill that inserts the government into nearly every aspect of American life. The American people understand that passing this bill will harm our country by fueling inflation, and it will harm our country for generations to come as we add to our debt.

It is no wonder that the Democrats are having so much trouble passing this. By shuttering our Federal Surface Transportation Programs last Friday, House Democrats made it abundantly clear that despite their rhetoric, physical infrastructure is not a priority. Instead, they have said that roads, bridges, broadband, water infrastructure—all infrastructure items that Americans in both parties support are only worth funding if they are accompanied by another \$3.5 trillion in spending.

I hope that our House colleagues will change their approach. The bipartisan infrastructure bill represents good policy, and it should be allowed to pass on its own merit. It will benefit every State in this country. It will provide the certainty of 5 years of funding for our Surface Transportation Programs and avoid future lapses like we saw last Friday. These programs cannot bounce from one short-term extension to the next. We have done that before. It is very, very difficult to conduct business, and they should not play second fiddle to a package of partisan policies.

We came together in this body to pass a bipartisan infrastructure bill that the American people can be proud of, and that bill should become law soon.

I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MARKEY). The Senator from Wisconsin.

CORONAVIRUS

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President, last week, I came to the floor in support of Senator SCOTT's bill pushing back on what many of us consider the unconstitutional COVID vaccine mandates. I used my floor time to describe the lack of transparency of our healthcare Agencies by talking about the information that our healthcare Agencies, the

media, and the news media are not providing the American public. I come to the floor today to expand a little bit on that information.

Now, last week, I presented this chart, which shows the daily number of new cases. Those are the blue lines. You actually have daily deaths—the tragic deaths—very thin red line. But you also have this line showing the percent of fully vaccinated Americans.

Now, I pointed to this chart because this is not what I would expect to see if we had 100 percent effective vaccines. Now, let me again state, I was a big supporter of Operation Warp Speed. I am not an anti-vaxxer. I have had every vaccine up to this one because I had COVID.

So I had hoped and prayed that the COVID vaccine would be 100 percent safe and 100 percent effective, but this chart is not what I would expect to have seen with a vaccine that was highly effective and what we all were hoping would happen once we had a high percentage of Americans vaccinated, together with those who already had COVID, like myself, with natural immunity.

You can see, prior to the vaccine even being able to take effect, as the first major surge of the pandemic was winding down, I would have expected to see a continued winding down, but that is not what we saw. We have seen this surge in Delta, and we have seen additional deaths, and the tragedy continues.

Now, back on September 9, President Biden said: This pandemic is of the unvaccinated.

And he also said: This is not about freedom or personal choice.

No, this is exactly about freedom and personal choice. President Biden also said in July of this year—on July 21, he said: If you are vaccinated, you are not going to be hospitalized. You are not going to be in the ICU unit. You are not going to die. You are not going to get COVID if you have these vaccinations.

Today, I received an email from a constituent in Wisconsin. I am going to read an excerpt. I am not going to identify the individual because he fears reprisals. He has seen what happens to people that tell the truth about COVID and COVID vaccines, so I will keep his name anonymous.

But let me quote from his email: Both my parents were fully vaccinated with the Pfizer vaccine in the spring. Yet, in August, my mom became infected and then gave it to my dad. They became so sick that my sister, fully vaccinated with Moderna, moved in with them to care for them. She used PPEs and was careful, and she caught COVID too. Hence, my family, three of us, caught COVID while fully vaccinated. They spread it while they were fully vaccinated, from vaccinated to vaccinated. My mom and sister recovered. Dad died in a week at home after a 3-week stay in the local hospital.

Now, that is a tragedy. I wish what President Biden said would have been true, but it is not. That talks to the vaccine's efficacy.

Let's talk about vaccine safety. I have heard so often from who I refer to as the "COVID gods"—the healthcare Agencies, the media, the news media—that vaccine adverse events are rare, and they are mild. Well, they are rare, and they are mild until they happen to you.

Here is a chart that compares the number of deaths reported on the VAERS system. Now, this is the CDC's own vaccine adverse event reporting system. And I charted this all the way back to 1990, at the beginning of the VAERS system, and I got deaths associated with the flu vaccine there in blue. You can barely see them. But the largest year, the peak year for the VAERS-reported deaths associated with the flu vaccine was—in 2010, there was 162 reported deaths.

Now, again, I understand that the VAERS does not prove causation. I have got that. But if you compare our experience since 1990 with the flu vaccine—by the way, it is generally about a third of the number of doses for an annual flu season versus what we have experienced with the COVID vaccine.

So you compare that very low level of deaths reported on VAERS to what we now experienced with COVID, for just this count here, and it is 15,737 worldwide for the 3 vaccines that have emergency use authorization in the United States. In total, it is 15,937 deaths reported on the VAERS system.

Now, again, I realize that does not prove causation, but I do need to point out that 5,272 of those deaths occurred on day zero, 1, or 2 following vaccination. Now, if I were in the CDC or FDA, those Agencies that in October of 2020 touted the VAERS report, their early warning safety surveillance systems—before the vaccines ever got the emergency use authorization—they were talking about how they were going to rely on these to provide the safety signals. I remember one member of the CDC saying: We are going to take adverse events so seriously that if somebody loses a couple of days work, lost work time because of an adverse event, we are going to get a CDC representative on the phone with that individual, and we are going to look into it.

That simply has not happened.

Now, one thing that the FDA has done is they have ridiculed some of the early treatment drugs. I don't have it on the chart here, but I just want to put things in perspective. So, now, again, 15,937 deaths in about 10 months with the COVID vaccine. Ivermectin, since 1996, over 25 years, has 379 total deaths. That is 15,937, COVID vaccine; Ivermectin, 379 in 25 years; Hydroxychloroquine, about 1,039 deaths over 25 years; Remdesivir, which appears to be the drug of choice for hospitalized COVID patients, 1,499 deaths. Again, that is information our Federal Agencies aren't providing the Amer-

ican public, but this is information people need to know.

Now, why am I giving you this information? Well, first of all, on social media, this is suppressed. This is being censored. People like me that would even broach the subject of VAERS have been attacked.

So I think it is important to come to the Senate floor so the American people understand what is happening. But the main point I am trying to make is, those individuals who believe in their own health autonomy, believe in their own personal freedom, many of whom have already been infected with COVID, are reading the science and believe, based on what they are reading, that their natural immunity is probably as, if not more, effective than the vaccinated immunity and have chosen not to get the vaccine. That is their right. You may not agree with that, but it is not your body. It is not your right to impose on someone else a mandate to take the vaccine or take away their job, take away their livelihood, and take away their healthcare.

By the way, I am not the only one that thinks this. President Biden, back on December 4, said: I don't think it should be mandatory. I wouldn't demand it be mandatory.

The Press Secretary said: The vaccine mandate is not the Federal Government's role.

And yet here we are, nurses being fired. What do you think that is going to do to our healthcare system? We already have a severe healthcare worker shortage. We are going to exacerbate that problem.

These mandates are unconstitutional, but they are going to be incredibly harmful for military readiness and for our healthcare system. They are also going to be incredibly corrosive to our society.

I have been inundated—even well before President Biden announced his ill-advised and unconstitutional mandate, I have been inundated with emails and letters and phone calls from people who are so concerned about being coerced, being forced to take a vaccine under duress. It has had an incredibly corrosive effect on our society.

But I want to quote from one particular letter. I got this letter from a nurse. She has a master's degree. She is also a professor of nursing. She is describing what happened inside a meeting of their faculty as they were deciding how to handle mandates in their nursing school.

She writes: Some of the biggest issues today are the conversations occurring behind closed doors. Our nursing department faculty got together to decide how to handle the nearly 50 percent of students that hadn't yet received their COVID-19 vaccination and faced being dismissed from their nursing program unless they complied. The students were referred to as "ignorant," "uneducated," "killers."

This name-calling, although deeply inappropriate, is becoming the cultural

norm against the masses of those who decide that it is within their right to attack the personal choice of others.

But if I were a student or a parent of a student who heard that interaction that I am about to share with you, you would be beyond furious.

When it was determined by consensus of the faculty group that we were not going to allow any special accommodations—in other words, switching of clinical assignments or sites—to allow for the unvaccinated students to progress, and that will be the standard practice in all other nursing programs soon, one faculty member exclaimed to the group: "Good luck finding a new career."

And the group responded with laughter.

This nurse writes: Let that sink in for a moment. They laughed. They laughed at the thought of someone's dreams being crushed.

That's the effect these unconstitutional, coercive, freedom-robbing mandates are having on our society. There is no need for them.

As the previous email from my constituent that I received today proves, even if you have been fully vaccinated, you can catch COVID. You can transmit COVID. You can die from COVID. Now, it is a tragedy. I wish it weren't so, but it is true.

When are we going to start following the science? When are we going to reclaim the freedom that has been lost in this pandemic?

There has been enough harm done during the course of this pandemic. I am begging this body; I am begging the President, do no further harm.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. 2848

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, last week, I came to the Senate floor no fewer than three times and invited my colleagues to pass bills to protect millions of Americans at risk of losing their jobs, their livelihoods, due to President Biden's COVID-19 vaccine mandate.

Unfortunately, due to objections from the other side of the aisle, these bills were not adopted. But I committed then, as I do again today, that I will be back with additional proposals for as long as it takes to beat this sweeping mandate.

Since I began this effort against the mandate, there has been a massive outpouring of support from across the country. I have heard from Americans in countless sectors, from multiple States, who are at risk of losing their jobs. These Americans just want to make their own medical decisions—a right that has always been afforded and not challenged since the beginning of our Nation.

In Utah alone, I have heard from no fewer than 184 people who are at risk of losing their livelihoods. They and so many others, those who share the same concerns, are our neighbors; they are everyday Americans, and they have legitimate medical concerns about getting the vaccine.

But President Biden doesn't care. He said simply, "This isn't about freedom or personal choice."

Well, to the millions of Americans who face the punishment of being made unemployable if they do not succumb to the President's will, this very much is about freedom and personal choice. There must be a more reasonable answer. There must be a more compassionate answer.

The COVID-19 vaccine has been deemed generally safe. I don't dispute that. In fact, I, along with my entire family, have been vaccinated. I see the development of these vaccines as a miracle and a blessing. But there are some people with preexisting conditions or complications. Many of these individuals have been advised by their trusted, board-certified doctors that they should not receive the vaccine. These Americans, they deserve to be able to make their own medical decisions, and they should not be forced by the President of the United States to go against the advice of their doctors.

Now let's look down the road at what will necessarily follow this vaccine mandate. Countless Americans who follow the recommendations of their doctors would lose their jobs in an already troubled economy. These individuals and families would not be just unemployed; the President of the United States would deem them unemployable, second-class pariahs. Businesses that dare to employ the unvaccinated would be subject to crippling fines and risk closure.

The President of the United States, unilaterally, without any say from the people's Representatives in Congress, is set on imposing financial destruction on many American families and businesses. He is even targeting those with complicated medical conditions and forcibly removing them from the economy and much of broader society.

So today, I am offering the Senate an option to take a more compassionate, reasonable approach. My bill, the Your Health Comes First Act, would exempt from the President's mandate individuals with personal health concerns related to the vaccine.

Simply put, Americans who are worried about how the vaccine would interact with or compound their existing medical difficulties would not be obligated to get it. Those who have been advised by their doctors not to get the vaccine due to preexisting medical conditions would not be forced to go against the recommendations of their doctor.

This bill is a reasonable and a compassionate solution to allow concerned Americans the dignity and autonomy we all deserve.

This isn't the only flaw with the mandate. As I have said before, the President lacks authority to do this. Neither the Federal Government, in general, nor the President of the United States, in particular, has the power under the Constitution to implement a broad mandate of this sort.

Whether you think government ought to be mandating it or not, whether you think government ought to force people out of their jobs if they refuse to get it or not, that is a different, analytically distinct question in our constitutional system from whether the Federal Government has the authority, generally, or the President, in particular, has the authority. It doesn't, and he does not.

These arguments need to remain at the forefront of the conversation: questions regarding the constitutionality and the constitutional authority to issue this in the first place.

I will be back tomorrow with another proposal, and I will be at this for as long as it takes to end this unconstitutional and uncompassionate mandate.

Mr. President, as if in legislative session, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions be discharged from further consideration of S. 2848, and that the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered read a third time and passed and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object. Yesterday, Tallahassee Memorial Hospital disclosed that 82 people died inside their healthcare system from COVID over the course of the month of September. That is the worst month on record for that hospital system.

It is not shocking to anyone because we just went passed 700,000 people who have now been killed by this virus in the United States of America. And this attack that continues to be launched on the Senate floor against science and against sound public health policy is standing in the way of us defeating this virus.

Now, I will speak to Senator LEE's objection, but Senator JOHNSON just came to the floor and opened up his remarks by declaring he that wasn't an anti-vaxxer and then just engaged in a 10-minute broadside against vaccines, citing conspiracy theory after conspiracy theory. The effect will be to undermine America's faith in vaccines that are working.

To prove his point, the Senator from Wisconsin read an email from a constituent who got the vaccine and got infected.

I am sure that is true. There are, in fact, people who have gotten the vaccine who have gotten the infection. It isn't 100 percent effective.

But he didn't cite these statistics: those who have been vaccinated are 10 times less likely to be hospitalized. Those who have been vaccinated are 10 times less likely to die.

Here are some numbers from the State of Pennsylvania that I just saw

this morning: In Pennsylvania, 97 percent of deaths are amongst the unvaccinated; 95 percent of hospitalizations are amongst the unvaccinated; and 94 percent of cases are amongst the unvaccinated.

Senator LEE is right, vaccines work—vaccines work, and I appreciate his statement to that effect. But others, like the Senator from Wisconsin, are coming down to the floor, and their words have the effect of undermining people's faith in science, and that is deadly. That is deadly.

As to Senator LEE's objections, I know he makes them in good faith, but my impression is that this Congress and this country decided a long time ago that the government does have a role to play when it comes to the safety of our workplaces. In fact, that is the entire reason for the existence of OSHA. Whether you like it or not, from a policy perspective, OSHA has handed down mandate after mandate about what is necessary for employers to make sure that when you show up to work in a hospital or a factory or a school, that your workplace is safe.

Specifically, this country is not a stranger to vaccine mandates. In fact, every parent who sends their kids to school knows all about vaccine mandates because you have to make sure that your child is vaccinated before they go to school. Most of those schools have relatively reasonable exemptions—often, at the very least, medical exemptions; sometimes religious and philosophical exemptions.

Let's be clear: President Biden's plan includes commonsense considerations for exemptions.

Let's also be clear that, at least with respect to the OSHA requirement, it is a mandate for testing, not for vaccinations. There are other mandates that are requiring the vaccination take place, but the broadest of the proposed mandates is a mandate that everybody get tested; you don't have to get tested if you get the vaccine.

And so I am deeply worried about how unserious this country is about the science and about sound public health policy. We aren't going to get over this pandemic—we aren't going to be able to turn the page—unless people choose to get vaccinated: 10 times less likely to die, 10 times less likely to get hospitalized.

Yes, it is true, there are cases in which there may be medical contraindications. President Biden's plan accounts for that. And yes, it is true that there are individual people who have still had breakthrough cases. But this is an effective vaccine. It is a safe vaccine. And the only way that we save lives is if we stop focusing on ideology and keep our focus on science and what works.

And for that reason, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The objection is heard.

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, I appreciate the insight from my friend and distinguished colleague, the Senator from Connecticut.

I want to be very clear: The limited focus of this bill—the bill that I offered up for passage in the Senate today—is narrow.

It has one purpose: For those Americans who have a medical concern and who have been advised by their doctor, based on some condition associated with their health, that they should not get it, they shouldn't have to choose between getting vaccinated and losing their job.

My friend from Connecticut goes so far, I think, as to implicitly acknowledge that there ought to be an exception made for those people. One, he says, President Biden's vaccine mandate accommodates them.

Well, there is a problem with that. President Biden hasn't issued anything. He has suggested, along with members of his administration, that there might be a somewhat accommodation for them. I am not sure what that means, neither is corporate America. A lot of corporate America, acting on the advice of legal counsel and human resources departments, tends to be adopting rules already. Some of them take exceptions like these into account; others do not.

Look, it is really not too much to ask. I suggest that if you are going to impose a sweeping mandate like this, that you ought to have some protection for people with complicating medical conditions, who, on the advice of a board-certified physician, choose not to get it.

Now, again, this does not mean that I am OK with the rest of the mandate; I am not. And I respectfully, but very strongly, disagree with my friend's characterization that this is just fine for the Federal Government to do.

The Federal Government lacks general police powers. The lion's share of the authority within government in our system lies with the States and their political subdivisions.

Our national government is in charge of just a few basic and distinctively national matters: national defense, a uniformed system of weights and measures, trademarks, copyrights, and patents, regulating trade or commerce between the States with foreign nations and with the Indian Tribes.

There are a number of others, but there is no power in there that just refers to providing generally for laws that make the American people safe and healthy.

Those powers exist in America; they just aren't vested in this government. It doesn't mean that States and localities will always exercise that power wisely or prudently or compassionately, but it means insofar as you are going to act through government, that is the appropriate place and not this one.

Now, my friend from Connecticut then responds by saying, "Yeah, but the power is still there anyway."

Even if I were to assume his point that the power of the Federal Government somehow extends to an individual

vaccine mandate, which it doesn't—and I would challenge him or anyone else to cite what provision of the U.S. Constitution it is that that provides that authority—but even if we were to accept the premise, just for purposes of discussion, that the Federal Government may exercise such authority, the President may not exercise that authority alone.

The very first clause of the first article—in the first section of the first article of that Constitution says: "All legislative Powers herein granted shall be vested in our Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and House of Representatives."

Article I, section 7 then makes clear that in order to pass a law, a Federal law in the United States—that is, in order to adopt a policy of the Federal Government, enforceable through the overpowering force that is the Federal Government—you have to follow the article I, section 7 formula, which means you have to take a legislative proposal—a bill—you have to pass it in the House, and you have to pass it in the Senate with the same language—and it has to be submitted to the President for signature, veto, or acquiescence.

If you don't undertake that process at all, there is no authority in the executive to do anything like what they are describing. What President Biden has done is to arrogate to himself powers that he not only characterizes as Federal, but, really, are legislative powers that he doesn't possess.

The President of the United States is the chief executive. He is not a lawmaker. And he certainly is not the entire legislative branch. And so that, really, is quite beside the point.

It doesn't make a difference with his Federal authority. The fact that Federal authority is asserted to exist, which it is not, and we can't identify a single clause of article I, section 8, or another part of the Constitution that can fairly be read, especially against the backdrop of its original public meaning, to convey that power—but even if you concede that point, there is no reasonable, plausible, defensible argument that would say the President of the United States may wield this authority unilaterally.

That is what despots and tyrants would have the power to do. And if there is one thing that is very consistent and uniform in our constitutional structure it is that no one person, no one group of people, is ever supposed to be able to accumulate dangerous degrees of power and that the President of the United States is neither a lawmaker nor the entire legislative branch. He may not step into those shoes.

As to the assertion about science, my friend and colleague referred to this as somehow a war on science. It is not a war on science to suggest that the President lacks authority to do something unilaterally. I would call that a war on the Constitution, frankly.

It is not a war on science to say that whenever a government acts, it ought to do so out of an abundance of caution and out of respect for the people to provide reasonable accommodations to individuals who have medical conditions that make them uniquely vulnerable to what the government is inclined to require.

Again, this mandate is unconstitutional. It doesn't make the vaccine bad. In fact, the vaccine is a blessing, and I think the American people have been made safer as a result of it.

That doesn't mean every American must get it. It certainly doesn't mean that it is any of the Federal Government's business to tell people that they have to choose between getting the vaccine and losing their job, especially with regard to individuals who have preexisting medical conditions that would make it dangerous for them to do so in the judgment of their board-certified medical physician. That is wrong. That is absolutely wrong.

Now, look, COVID-19 has imposed a lot of tragedies, and it is heartbreaking. A number of people we have lost, including the individuals who have died in the last month at Tallahassee Memorial Hospital, who he mentioned—every one of those lives is of infinite eternal value. Those are unrepeatable lives lost to a deadly pandemic. My heart goes out to each one of those souls who has departed, along with their families.

We are reminded of the lives that have tragically been lost to COVID-19 by an exhibit that has been up on the Mall, up around the Washington Monument. It is beautiful, really. There are little flags—small flags—each of them white, each one representing one of the Americans who has been lost to COVID-19 since it broke out just over a year and a half ago. There are about 700,000 of those around the Washington Monument. From a distance, it looks a little like snow.

I come from a State where there is usually snow at the top of mountains. It looks familiar to me when I see what looks like snow from a distance, but it is somber as I remember what they actually represent.

If we want to talk about the loss of human life, we have to talk about the loss of all human life, and we also have to talk about the right of each individual to live and to continue living and to follow the advice of medical doctors based on the individuals' own medical conditions.

I sometimes find staggering the accusations that those who have concerns with this are somehow committing a war on science. Against which science? Who exactly is it that is against science—the science that tells us that unborn human life can experience and respond to pain in the womb in 15 or 20 weeks of gestational development?

What would it look like if we had a separate memorial with little red flags instead of little white ones, each representing one of the human lives lost every single year to abortion?

You see, every single year we lose about the same number of human lives to abortion as we have lost to COVID since it first broke out. If for the last 50 years we had a little red flag, each marking one of those human lives lost, there would be a sea of red. It would take up not just the grass all around the Washington Monument, which is large, it would probably take up all the grass between the Capitol, the Washington Monument, and the Lincoln Memorial. It would be a sea of red.

So, no, no, you can't say that this is a war on science to be concerned about individuals being able to make their own decision about whether to get this vaccine.

If you want to accuse people on the other side of the aisle of doing something, you have to stop and think about other decisions that we make—other decisions that some are willing to defend, decisions that involve a whole lot of human suffering and a whole lot of loss of a whole lot of human lives.

I get that a lot of people disagree on these things, but the fact that we disagree on them doesn't mean that they don't exist. It certainly doesn't mean that we can stand by and watch as if a vestigial legislative organ—as one single man steps into the shoes of 435 Representatives or 100 Senators—makes, as it were, a law that, on its own, fails even to accommodate good-faith medical concerns backed up by medical science.

It is too bad that we couldn't pass this simple law today. We could have; we should have; I wish we would have. I will be back. This issue isn't going away. Neither am I.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to complete my remarks before the vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NOMINATION OF LAUREN J. KING

Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. President, I come to the floor this afternoon to support the nomination of Lauren King to serve as judge for the U.S. District Court of Western Washington. I am pleased to have recommended her to President Biden.

As a citizen of the Muscogee Nation, Ms. King will be the first Native American Federal judge from my home State and only the sixth-ever Native judge in our country's history.

She is extremely well qualified and has an abundance of Tribal court experience, something that is very important in my State. We are home to 29 federally recognized Tribes, and it is long overdue that our Federal court

system includes those who have deep understanding and appreciation of Tribal trust responsibilities and Federal Indian law.

Ms. King has extensive litigation experience and is a recognized leader in Tribal law. She has been a pro tem appellate judge for the Northwest Intertribal Court System since 2013. She has also served as a commissioner on the Washington State Gambling Commission and chairs her law firm's Native American Law Practice Group.

A graduate from the University of Washington and the University of Virginia School of Law, she has also taught Federal Indian law at Seattle University. She has earned the support of the National Congress of American Indians, the Affiliated Tribes of Northwest Indians, and other leading Native organizations.

I know she will make an excellent addition to our court in the Western District of Washington, and I urge my colleagues to support her nomination.

VOTE ON KING NOMINATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All postcloture time has expired.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the King nomination?

Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) is necessarily absent.

The result was announced—yeas 55, nays 44, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 407 Ex.]

YEAS—55

Baldwin	Hickenlooper	Reed
Bennet	Hirono	Rosen
Blumenthal	Kaine	Rounds
Booker	Kelly	Sanders
Brown	King	Schatz
Cantwell	Klobuchar	Schumer
Cardin	Leahy	Shaheen
Carper	Lujan	Sinema
Casey	Manchin	Smith
Collins	Markey	Stabenow
Coons	McConnell	Tester
Cortez Masto	Menendez	Van Hollen
Duckworth	Merkley	Warner
Durbin	Murkowski	Warnock
Gillibrand	Murphy	Warren
Graham	Murray	Whitehouse
Grassley	Ossoff	Wyden
Hassan	Padilla	
Heinrich	Peters	

NAYS—44

Barrasso	Fischer	Risch
Blackburn	Hagerty	Romney
Blunt	Hawley	Rubio
Boozman	Hoeven	Sasse
Braun	Hyde-Smith	Scott (FL)
Burr	Inhofe	Scott (SC)
Capito	Johnson	Shelby
Cassidy	Kennedy	Sullivan
Cornyn	Lankford	Thune
Cotton	Lee	Tillis
Cramer	Lummis	Toomey
Crapo	Marshall	Tuberville
Cruz	Moran	Wicker
Daines	Paul	Young
Ernst	Portman	

NOT VOTING—1

Feinstein

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PETERS). Under the previous order, the motion to reconsider is considered made and laid upon the table, and the President will be immediately notified of the Senate's actions.

The Senator from Virginia.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate consider Calendar No. 390, and that the Senate vote on the nomination without intervening action or debate.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the nomination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of the following named officer for appointment to the grade indicated in the United States Space Force under title 10, U.S.C., section 716: to be Brigadier General, Brig. Gen. Gregory J. Gagnon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Gagnon nomination?

The nomination was confirmed.

Mr. WARNER. I ask unanimous consent that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table, all without intervening action or debate; that no further motions be in order to the nomination; that any statements related to the nomination be printed in the RECORD; and that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. WARNER. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate consider the following nominations en bloc: Calendar Nos. 392 through 399; that the Senate vote on the nominations en bloc, without intervening action or debate; that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate; that any statements related to the nomination be printed in the RECORD; and that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the nominations en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nominations of Jessica D. Aber, of Virginia, to be United States Attorney for the Eastern District of Virginia for the term of four years; Carla B. Freedman, of New York, to be United States Attorney for the Northern District of New York for the term of four years; William J. Ihlenfeld II, of West Virginia, to be United States Attorney for the Northern District of West Virginia for the

term of four years; Christopher R. Kavanaugh, of Virginia, to be United States Attorney for the Western District of Virginia for the term of four years; Darcie N. McElwee, of Maine, to be United States Attorney for the District of Maine for the term of four years; Breon S. Peace, of New Jersey, to be United States Attorney for the Eastern District of New York for the term of four years; William S. Thompson, of West Virginia, to be United States Attorney for the Southern District of West Virginia for the term of four years; and Damian Williams, of New York, to be United States Attorney for the Southern District of New York for the term of four years?

The nominations were confirmed en bloc.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to legislative session and be in a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NOTICES OF A TIE VOTE UNDER S. RES. 27

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to print the following letters into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. SENATE, COMMITTEE ON BANKING, HOUSING, AND URBAN AFFAIRS,

Washington, DC, October 5, 2021.

To the Secretary of the Senate:

PN433, the nomination of Solomon Jeffrey Greene, of the District of Columbia, to be an Assistant Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, vice Seth Daniel Appleton, having been referred to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs, the Committee with a quorum present, has vote on the nomination as follows—

1. On the question of reporting the nomination favorably with the recommendation that the nomination be confirmed 12 ayes to 12 noes; and

In accordance with Section 3 paragraph (1)(A) of S. Res. 27 of the 117th Congress, I hereby give notice that the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs has not reported the nomination because of a tie vote and ask that this notice be printed in the Record pursuant to the Resolution.

U.S. SENATE, COMMITTEE ON BANKING, HOUSING, AND URBAN AFFAIRS,

Washington, DC, October 5, 2021.

To the Secretary of the Senate:

PN604, the nomination of Brian Eddie Nelson, of California, to be Under Secretary for Terrorism and Financial Crimes, vice Sigal Mandelker, resigned, having been referred to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs, the Committee with a quorum

present, has vote on the nomination as follows—

1. On the question of reporting the nomination favorably with the recommendation that the nomination be confirmed 12 ayes to 12 noes; and

In accordance with Section 3 paragraph (1)(A) of S. Res. 27 of the 117th Congress, I hereby give notice that the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs has not reported the nomination because of a tie vote and ask that this notice be printed in the Record pursuant to the Resolution.

U.S. SENATE, COMMITTEE ON BANKING, HOUSING, AND URBAN AFFAIRS,

Washington, DC, October 5, 2021.

To the Secretary of the Senate:

PN605, the nomination of Elizabeth Rosenberg, of Vermont, to be Assistant Secretary for Terrorist Financing, Department of the Treasury, vice Marshall Billingslea, having been referred to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs, the Committee with a quorum present, has vote on the nomination as follows—

1. On the question of reporting the nomination favorably with the recommendation that the nomination be confirmed 12 ayes to 12 noes; and

In accordance with Section 3 paragraph (1)(A) of S. Res. 27 of the 117th Congress, I hereby give notice that the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs has not reported the nomination because of a tie vote and ask that this notice be printed in the Record pursuant to the Resolution.

U.S. SENATE, COMMITTEE ON BANKING, HOUSING, AND URBAN AFFAIRS,

Washington, DC, October 5, 2021.

To the Secretary of the Senate:

PN747, the nomination of David Uejio, of California, to be an Assistant Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, vice Anna Maria Farias, having been referred to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs, the Committee with a quorum present, has vote on the nomination as follows—

1. On the question of reporting the nomination favorably with the recommendation that the nomination be confirmed 12 ayes to 12 noes; and

In accordance with Section 3 paragraph (1)(A) of S. Res. 27 of the 117th Congress, I hereby give notice that the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs has not reported the nomination because of a tie vote and ask that this notice be printed in the Record pursuant to the Resolution.

U.S. SENATE, COMMITTEE ON BANKING, HOUSING, AND URBAN AFFAIRS,

Washington, DC, October 5, 2021.

To the Secretary of the Senate:

PN767, the nomination of Julia Ruth Gordon, of Maryland, to be an Assistant Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, vice Dana T. Wade, having been referred to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs, the Committee with a quorum present, has vote on the nomination as follows—

1. On the question of reporting the nomination favorably with the recommendation that the nomination be confirmed 12 ayes to 12 noes; and

In accordance with Section 3 paragraph (1)(A) of S. Res. 27 of the 117th Congress, I hereby give notice that the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs has not reported the nomination because of a tie vote and ask that this notice be printed in the Record pursuant to the Resolution.

VOTE EXPLANATION

Mr. KELLY. Mr. President, on October 4, 2021, I missed the vote No. 403 on confirmation of Jonathan Meyer to be General Counsel for the Department of Homeland Security. Had I been in attendance, I would have voted yes on his confirmation.

TRIBUTE TO ANITA DEASON

Mr. BOOZMAN. Mr. President, I rise to honor the service of Colonel (retired) Anita Deason as she retires from her work on behalf of the people of Arkansas, and especially the military and veterans community, as a member of my staff in the U.S. Senate.

Colonel Deason started her lifetime of service at 19 years old when she joined the Arkansas Army National Guard. She retired from that career in 2013 with 33 years of service and soon after joined my staff as our military and veterans liaison. Throughout her tenure with my office, she has used her knowledge and experience to improve programs and services for countless veterans and their families.

Over the past 7 years, Colonel Deason has traveled all across the Natural State to meet with veterans' organizations; visit local, State, and Federal facilities, as well as nonprofits; and resolve countless problems for her fellow veterans. Whether bringing groups together to tackle difficult issues or lending her support to promising new programs, she used every skill and connection she had to improve the lives of the men and women who serve our State and our Nation.

Of all her accomplishments during her time in the Senate, Anita is probably best known as a champion of the Library of Congress Veterans History Project. She spearheaded my office's involvement in this program to ensure that stories of America's veterans are recorded for generations to come. At that time, Arkansas veterans were underrepresented in this national collection, so she set out to conduct interviews and train other Arkansans to do the same. She ensured that veterans from all eras are included and that previously overlooked stories were recorded from veterans of color, women veterans, and others who served our country with honor and helped shape our modern military. She taught workshops, gave media interviews and trained other congressional staff, all in an effort to make the project even more robust and successful because of her passion for helping to learn about and preserve our former servicemembers' stories and experiences.

Her tenure in the Senate is only a small portion of Colonel Deason's public service. During her career in the Arkansas Army National Guard, she served as a platoon leader, detachment commander, company executive officer, and company commander. She was eventually promoted to colonel while serving as the human resources officer.

She received a number of awards and decorations during her military career including the Legion of Merit, Meritorious Service Medal, and the Arkansas Commendation Medal. In 2018, she was inducted into the Arkansas Military Veterans Hall of Fame. It was a well-deserved honor for her tremendous military service and her dedication to fighting for the needs of servicemembers and veterans throughout her years with the U.S. Senate.

It has been a blessing and true honor to have Anita Deason as a member of my team. Her unique perspective, dedication, and caring nature have been invaluable in our work to meet the needs of Arkansas' veterans. She truly made a difference. We will all miss working with her and wish her the best of luck in retirement.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Swann, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

In executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations and a withdrawal which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The messages received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

At 10:02 a.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Alli, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker has signed the following enrolled bills:

S. 1917. An act to establish a K-12 education cybersecurity initiative, and for other purposes.

H.R. 2278. An act to designate the September 11th National Memorial Trail Route, and for other purposes.

The enrolled bills were subsequently signed by the President pro tempore (Mr. LEAHY).

MEASURES READ THE FIRST TIME

The following bill was read the first time:

S. 4. A bill to amend the Voting Rights Act of 1965 to revise the criteria for determining which States and political subdivisions are subject to section 4 of the Act, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, October 5, 2021, she had presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bill:

S. 1917. An act to establish a K-12 education cybersecurity initiative, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, and were referred as indicated:

EC-2329. A communication from the Director of the Legal Processing Division, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Recapture of Excess Employment Tax Credits under the American Rescue Plan Act of 2021" (RIN1545-BQ09) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 23, 2021; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-2330. A communication from the Director of the Legal Processing Division, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Notice regarding the Special Per Diem Rates for 2021-2022" (Notice 2021-52) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 23, 2021; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-2331. A communication from the Director of the Legal Processing Division, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Guidance on Reporting Qualified Sick Leave Wages and Qualified Family Leave Wages Paid For Leave Provided in 2021" (Notice 2021-53) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 23, 2021; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-2332. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act, the certification of a proposed license amendment for the export of firearms, parts, and components abroad controlled under Category I of the U.S. Munitions List to Germany in the amount of \$1,000,000 or more (Transmittal No. DDTC 21-049); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-2333. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to section 36(d) of the Arms Export Control Act, the certification of a proposed license amendment for the export of defense articles, including technical data and defense services to Germany, for the manufacture of significant military equipment abroad (Transmittal No. DDTC 20-025); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-2334. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act, the certification of a proposed license amendment for the export of defense articles, including technical data and defense services to Australia, the UK, and the UAE in the amount of \$50,000,000 or more (Transmittal No. DDTC 20-090); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-2335. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act, the certification of a proposed license amendment for the export of firearms abroad controlled under Category I of the U.S. Munitions List to Thailand in the amount of \$1,000,000 or more (Transmittal No. DDTC 20-082); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-2336. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act, the certification of a proposed license amendment for the export of defense articles, including technical data and defense

services to the UK in the amount of \$50,000,000 or more (Transmittal No. DDTC 21-018); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-2337. A communication from the Secretary of Education, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Total and Permanent Disability Discharge of Loans Under Title IV of the Higher Education Act" (RIN1840-AD48) received in the Office of the President pro tempore of the Senate; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-2338. A communication from the Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Affairs, Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Allocation of Assets in Single-Employer Plans; Interest Assumptions for Valuing Benefits" (29 CFR Part 404) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 28, 2021; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-2339. A communication from the Regulations Coordinator, Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; Updating Payment Parameters, Section 1332 Waiver Implementing Regulations, and Improving Health Insurance Markets for 2022 and Beyond" (RIN0938-AU60) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 30, 2021; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-2340. A communication from the Director of Regulations and Policy Management Staff, Food and Drug Administration, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Import Tolerances for Residues of Unapproved New Animal Drugs in Food" (RIN0910-AF78) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 28, 2021; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-2341. A communication from the Compliance Specialist, Wage and Hour Division, Department of Labor, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Tip Regulations Under the Fair Labor Standards Act (FLSA); Partial Withdrawal" (RIN1235-AA21) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 28, 2021; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-2342. A communication from the Board Members of the Railroad Retirement Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Board's fiscal year 2021 Annual Report; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-2343. A communication from the Secretary of Labor and the Director of the Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation's fiscal year 2020 Actuarial Evaluation of the Expected Operations and Status of the PBGC Funds; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-2344. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 24-176, "Fiscal Year 2022 Budget Support Act of 2021"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-2345. A communication from the Director, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Hiring Authority for Post-Secondary Students" (RIN3206-AN86) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 28, 2021; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-2346. A communication from the Director, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Access to Federal Employees Health Benefits (FEHB) for Employees of Certain Tribally Controlled Schools" (RIN3206-AO18) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 28, 2021; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-2347. A communication from the Associate General Counsel for General Law, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy in the position of Deputy Administrator, Federal Emergency Management Agency, Department of Homeland Security, received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 28, 2021; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-2348. A communication from the Associate General Counsel for General Law, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy in the position of Under Secretary for Management, Department of Homeland Security, received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 28, 2021; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-2349. A communication from the Director of the Office of Regulatory Affairs and Collaborative Action, Bureau of Indian Affairs, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Indian Business Incubators Program" (RIN1076-AF63) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 30, 2021; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

EC-2350. A communication from the Agency Representative, Patent and Trademark Office, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "2021 Increase of the Annual Limit on Accepted Requests for Track One Prioritized Examination" (RIN0651-AD56) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 28, 2021; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-2351. A communication from the Chief of the Regulatory Coordination Division, Citizenship and Immigration Services, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Asylum Interview Interpreter Requirement Modification Due to COVID-19" (RIN1615-AC59) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 23, 2021; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-2352. A communication from the Regulation Development Coordinator, Office of Regulation Policy and Management, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Presumptive Service Connection for Respiratory Conditions Due to Exposure to Particulate Matter" (RIN2900-AR25) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 23, 2021; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

EC-2353. A communication from the Regulation Development Coordinator, Office of Regulation Policy and Management, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Nomenclature Change for Position Title" (RIN2900-AR09) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 23, 2021; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

EC-2354. A communication from the Regulation Development Coordinator, Office of Regulation Policy and Management, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Extension of the Presumptive Period for Compensation for Gulf War Veterans" (RIN2900-AR22) received in the Office of the

President of the Senate on September 23, 2021; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

EC-2355. A communication from the Regulation Development Coordinator, Office of Regulation Policy and Management, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Veterans Care Agreements" (RIN2900-AQ45) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 23, 2021; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

EC-2356. A communication from the Regulation Development Coordinator, Office of Regulation Policy and Management, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Extension of Program of Comprehensive Assistance for Family Caregivers Eligibility for Legacy Participants and Legacy Applicants" (RIN2900-AR28) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 23, 2021; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

EC-2357. A communication from the Regulation Development Coordinator, Office of Regulation Policy and Management, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Elimination of Copayment for Opioid Antagonists and Education on use of Opioid Antagonists" (RIN2900-AQ31) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 23, 2021; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

EC-2358. A communication from the Regulation Development Coordinator, Office of Regulation Policy and Management, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Referral for VA Administrative Decision for Character of Discharge Determinations" (RIN2900-AR03) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 23, 2021; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. PETERS, from the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, without amendment:

S. 2551. A bill to require the Director of the Office of Management and Budget to establish or otherwise provide an artificial intelligence training program for the acquisition workforce, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 117-40).

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEE

The following executive reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. BROWN for the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

*Alan F. Estevez, of Maryland, to be Under Secretary of Commerce for Industry and Security.

*Graham Scott Steele, of California, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Treasury.

*Thea D. Rozman Kendler, of Maryland, to be an Assistant Secretary of Commerce.

*Alexia Marie Gabrielle Latortue, of the District of Columbia, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Treasury.

*Nomination was reported with recommendation that it be confirmed subject to the nominee's commitment to respond to requests to appear and testify before any duly constituted committee of the Senate.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first

and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. LEAHY (for himself, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. WARNOCK, Mr. OSSOFF, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BENNET, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. BROWN, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. CARPER, Mr. CASEY, Mr. COONS, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. KAINE, Mr. KELLY, Mr. KING, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. LUJÁN, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. MURPHY, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. PADILLA, Mr. PETERS, Mr. REED, Ms. ROSEN, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. SCHATZ, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Ms. SINEMA, Ms. SMITH, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. TESTER, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. WARNER, Ms. WARREN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, and Mr. WYDEN):

S. 4. A bill to amend the Voting Rights Act of 1965 to revise the criteria for determining which States and political subdivisions are subject to section 4 of the Act, and for other purposes; read the first time.

By Ms. KLOBUCHAR (for herself and Ms. LUMMIS):

S. 2930. A bill to amend the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act to modify requirements for local school wellness policies; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

By Mr. TUBERVILLE (for himself and Ms. LUMMIS):

S. 2931. A bill to amend the Defense Production Act of 1950 to prevent harm and disruption to the United States agriculture industry by protecting against foreign influence over agriculture production and supply chains, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Ms. BALDWIN (for herself and Mr. JOHNSON):

S. 2932. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 430 South Knowles Avenue in New Richmond, Wisconsin, as the "Captain Robert C. Harmon and Private John R. Peirson Post Office Building"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. MARSHALL:

S. 2933. A bill to impose sanctions with respect to members of the Chinese Community Party and heads of Chinese health agencies relating to the COVID-19 pandemic, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. TOOMEY (for himself, Mr. WARNER, Mr. CARPER, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. CRAPO, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. GRASSLEY, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. KAINE, Mr. KING, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. LEE, Mr. MORAN, Mr. SASSE, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina, Mrs. SHAHEEN, and Mr. TILLIS):

S. 2934. A bill to amend the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 to impose limitations on the authority of the President to adjust imports that are determined to threaten to impair national security, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. TESTER (for himself, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. LEAHY, and Ms. DUCKWORTH):

S. 2935. A bill to amend the Family and Medical Leave Act of 1993 to provide leave because of the death of a son or daughter; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. CASSIDY:

S. 2936. A bill to amend the CARES Act and the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify

the treatment of related individuals under the employee retention tax credit; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. CARDIN (for himself, Mr. DURBIN, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. KAINE, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. MARKKEY, Ms. ROSEN, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. PETERS, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. PADILLA, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. LUJÁN, and Mr. SANDERS):

S. 2937. A bill to authorize humanitarian assistance and civil society support, promote democracy and human rights, and impose targeted sanctions with respect to human rights abuses in Burma, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. RUBIO (for himself and Mr. SCOTT of Florida):

S. 2938. A bill to designate the United States Courthouse and Federal Building located at 111 North Adams Street in Tallahassee, Florida, as the "Joseph Woodrow Hatchett United States Courthouse and Federal Building", and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. BENNET (for himself and Mr. KING):

S. 2939. A bill to amend the Help America Vote Act of 2002 to support State and local governments making a transition to ranked choice voting; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 172

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the names of the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING), the Senator from Iowa (Mr. GRASSLEY) and the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. REED) were added as cosponsors of S. 172, a bill to authorize the National Medal of Honor Museum Foundation to establish a commemorative work in the District of Columbia and its environs, and for other purposes.

S. 212

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the names of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY) and the Senator from Virginia (Mr. KAINE) were added as cosponsors of S. 212, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a refundable tax credit against income tax for the purchase of qualified access technology for the blind.

S. 344

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. OSSOFF) was added as a cosponsor of S. 344, a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to provide for concurrent receipt of veterans' disability compensation and retirement pay for disability retirees with fewer than 20 years of service and a combat-related disability, and for other purposes.

S. 464

At the request of Ms. MURKOWSKI, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) was added as a cosponsor of S. 464, a bill to amend the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 to require a group health plan or health insurance coverage offered in connection with such a plan to provide an exceptions process for any medication step therapy protocol, and for other purposes.

S. 535

At the request of Ms. ERNST, the names of the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. BURR), the Senator from Texas (Mr. CORNYN) and the Senator from Utah (Mr. ROMNEY) were added as cosponsors of S. 535, a bill to authorize the location of a memorial on the National Mall to commemorate and honor the members of the Armed Forces that served on active duty in support of the Global War on Terrorism, and for other purposes.

S. 659

At the request of Mr. YOUNG, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 659, a bill to require the Secretary of Transportation to promulgate regulations relating to commercial motor vehicle drivers under the age of 21, and for other purposes.

S. 796

At the request of Ms. DUCKWORTH, the names of the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO) and the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) were added as cosponsors of S. 796, a bill to codify maternity care coordination programs at the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes.

S. 834

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the name of the Senator from Virginia (Mr. KAINE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 834, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for the distribution of additional residency positions, and for other purposes.

S. 1063

At the request of Mrs. MURRAY, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1063, a bill to provide women with increased access to preventive and life-saving cancer screening.

S. 1147

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1147, a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to permit certain retired members of the uniformed services who have a service-connected disability to receive both disability compensation from the Department of Veterans Affairs for their disability and either retired pay by reason of their years of military service or Combat-Related Special Compensation, and for other purposes.

S. 1291

At the request of Mr. PETERS, the name of the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1291, a bill to provide for a standard record of service on active duty for members of the reserve components of the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

S. 1362

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from Iowa (Ms. ERNST) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1362, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for cov-

erage under the Medicare program of pharmacist services.

S. 1532

At the request of Mr. KAINE, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1532, a bill to provide a work opportunity tax credit for military spouses and to provide for flexible spending arrangements for childcare services for uniformed services families.

S. 1544

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the names of the Senator from Nevada (Ms. CORTEZ MASTO) and the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) were added as cosponsors of S. 1544, a bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to streamline enrollment under the Medicaid program of certain providers across State lines, and for other purposes.

S. 1596

At the request of Mr. ROUNDS, the names of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) and the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) were added as cosponsors of S. 1596, a bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in commemoration of the National World War II Memorial in Washington, DC, and for other purposes.

S. 1670

At the request of Ms. ERNST, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. WARNOCK) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1670, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a non-refundable credit for working family caregivers.

S. 1785

At the request of Mr. SCHATZ, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1785, a bill to repeal the debt ceiling, and for other purposes.

S. 1813

At the request of Mr. COONS, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1813, a bill to direct the Secretary of Health and Human Services to support research on, and expanded access to, investigational drugs for amyotrophic lateral sclerosis, and for other purposes.

S. 1873

At the request of Mr. CRAPO, the names of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) and the Senator from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO) were added as cosponsors of S. 1873, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for Medicare coverage of multi-cancer early detection screening tests.

S. 1986

At the request of Mrs. CAPITO, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1986, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act and the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2018 to expand and expedite access to cardiac rehabilitation programs and pulmonary rehabilitation programs under the Medicare program, and for other purposes.

S. 2011

At the request of Mr. COONS, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2011, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal to honor the contributions of all those whose efforts led to the successful development of life saving vaccines to combat the novel coronavirus.

S. 2096

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the name of the Senator from Arizona (Mr. KELLY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2096, a bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to authorize admission of Canadian retirees as long-term visitors for pleasure described in section 101(a)(15)(B) of such Act, and for other purposes.

S. 2221

At the request of Mr. CRUZ, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Mr. SULLIVAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2221, a bill to restrict executive agencies from acting in contravention of Executive Order 13950, and for other purposes.

S. 2233

At the request of Mr. BLUMENTHAL, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2233, a bill to establish a grant program for shuttered minor league baseball clubs, and for other purposes.

S. 2283

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the name of the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2283, a bill to improve the Veterans Crisis Line of the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes.

S. 2372

At the request of Mr. HEINRICH, the names of the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER) and the Senator from Nebraska (Mrs. FISCHER) were added as cosponsors of S. 2372, a bill to amend the Pittman-Robertson Wildlife Restoration Act to make supplemental funds available for management of fish and wildlife species of greatest conservation need as determined by State fish and wildlife agencies, and for other purposes.

S. 2471

At the request of Mr. SCHATZ, the names of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN) and the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER) were added as cosponsors of S. 2471, a bill to establish a community disaster assistance fund for housing and community development and to authorize the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to provide, from the fund, assistance through a community development block grant disaster recovery program, and for other purposes.

S. 2515

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2515, a bill to amend the

Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 to treat attendance at an institution of higher education the same as work for the purpose of determining eligibility to participate in the supplemental nutrition assistance program.

S. 2578

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the names of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) and the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) were added as cosponsors of S. 2578, a bill to extend the moratorium on residential evictions, and for other purposes.

S. 2683

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the names of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN), the Senator from Virginia (Mr. KAINE) and the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) were added as cosponsors of S. 2683, a bill to amend title XXXIII of the Public Health Service Act with respect to flexibility and funding for the World Trade Center Health Program, and for other purposes.

S. 2721

At the request of Mr. CRAPO, the name of the Senator from Nebraska (Mrs. FISCHER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2721, a bill to require the Internal Revenue Service to issue a report on the tax gap, to establish a fellowship program within the Internal Revenue Service to recruit mid-career tax professionals to create and participate in an audit task force, and for other purposes.

S. 2736

At the request of Mr. BURR, the names of the Senator from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN) and the Senator from Nebraska (Mrs. FISCHER) were added as cosponsors of S. 2736, a bill to exclude vehicles to be used solely for competition from certain provisions of the Clean Air Act, and for other purposes.

S. 2756

At the request of Mr. DAINES, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2756, a bill to posthumously award a Congressional Gold Medal, in commemoration of the service members who perished as a result of the attack in Afghanistan on August 26, 2021, during the evacuation of citizens of the United States and Afghan allies at Hamid Karzai International Airport, and for other purposes.

S. 2800

At the request of Ms. DUCKWORTH, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. SMITH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2800, a bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to support community college and industry partnerships, and for other purposes.

S. 2876

At the request of Mrs. SHAHEEN, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2876, a bill to prioritize the efforts of, and to enhance coordination among, United States agencies to encourage

countries in Central and Eastern Europe to improve the security of their telecommunications networks, and for other purposes.

S. 2890

At the request of Ms. ROSEN, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2890, a bill to allow the participants in the National Health Service Corps to defer their obligated service in order to receive training in palliative care services.

S. 2922

At the request of Ms. DUCKWORTH, the names of the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) and the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. HEINRICH) were added as cosponsors of S. 2922, a bill to establish a commission to study the war in Afghanistan.

S. RES. 183

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the names of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY), the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) and the Senator from Nebraska (Mrs. FISCHER) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 183, a resolution condemning the Government of Iran's state-sponsored persecution of its Baha'i minority and its continued violation of the International Covenants on Human Rights.

S. RES. 321

At the request of Mr. BLUMENTHAL, the names of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) and the Senator from Georgia (Mr. WARNOCK) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 321, a resolution expressing the sense of the Senate to reduce traffic fatalities to zero by 2050.

S. RES. 345

At the request of Mrs. SHAHEEN, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 345, a resolution expressing the sense of the Senate on the political situation in Belarus.

S. RES. 360

At the request of Mrs. SHAHEEN, the names of the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. BARRASSO), the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN), the Senator from Florida (Mr. SCOTT) and the Senator from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 360, a resolution celebrating the 30th anniversary of the independence of Ukraine from the former Soviet Union.

S. RES. 377

At the request of Ms. ROSEN, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 377, a resolution urging the European Union to designate Hizballah in its entirety as a terrorist organization.

S. RES. 380

At the request of Mr. RISCH, the names of the Senator from Texas (Mr. CORNYN) and the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 380, a resolution reiterating United States support for the people of the Republic of South Sudan in their quest for lasting peace, stability, and

democracy after 10 years of independence and calling for a review of United States policy toward South Sudan.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. LEAHY (for himself, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. WARNOCK, Mr. OSSOFF, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BENNET, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. BROWN, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. CARPER, Mr. CASEY, Mr. COONS, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. KAINE, Mr. KELLY, Mr. KING, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. LUJÁN, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. MURPHY, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. PADILLA, Mr. PETERS, Mr. REED, Ms. ROSEN, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. SCHATZ, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Ms. SINEMA, Ms. SMITH, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. TESTER, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. WARNER, Ms. WARREN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, and Mr. WYDEN):

S. 4. A bill to amend the Voting Rights Act of 1965 to revise the criteria for determining which States and political subdivisions are subject to section 4 of the Act, and for other purposes; read the first time.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, it is really with hope, pride, and optimism that I rise today to honor the legacy of an icon of the civil rights movement, a hero of democracy, and a dear personal friend of mine: John Lewis.

More than anything, John Lewis was a man of action. Where he saw suffering, he tried to end it. Where he saw injustice, he tried to correct it. Where “good trouble” was needed, he showed up for it.

The most fitting way to honor the legacy of John Lewis is to take action ourselves—the action that he would have. So it is with pride today that I introduce the John Lewis Voting Rights Advancement Act of 2021. It is a vital piece of legislation to restore the landmark Voting Rights Act.

Now, this legislation is the culmination of many months of tireless work across the Halls of Congress, back and forth between the House and the Senate. But that is exactly what Congressman Lewis would have wanted to see. That work began by building the record and telling the story of the current conditions for voters across the country.

But what did that record show?

A shocking picture.

Empowered by the Supreme Court’s damaging 2013 decision in *Shelby County v. Holder*, States across the country have been advancing and enacting sweeping voter suppression efforts to make it more—not less—difficult for American citizens to participate in their own democracy.

Can you imagine that—making it harder for Americans to participate in their own democracy?

And today, tens of thousands of Americans are being disenfranchised under the guise of State law. And it is no coincidence that certain communities consistently bear the brunt of these suppression schemes across the country.

Throughout our history, we have worked to make our democracy ever more inclusive, not exclusive. With each generation, we have sought to empower millions more to be equal participants in America’s system of self-government. So make no mistake: This tidal wave of voter suppression effort seeks to bend the arc of equal justice and equal rights backward. We should not allow that to stand.

Action in Congress is desperately needed. The House answered the call from Congressman Lewis and others to protect our precious, almost sacred right to vote, and they passed a bold version of the John Lewis Voting Rights Advancement Act earlier this year.

Today, in the Senate, we will be introducing a version of that bill that should get the votes needed to restore the Voting Rights Act.

This legislation addresses the Court’s 2013 and 2021 decision. This should be advanced here. It should be passed by the House, and it surely would be signed into law. And there is no reason for delay.

This legislation addresses the Supreme Court’s *Shelby County* decision by restoring the Justice Department’s preclearance powers to prevent States from enacting discriminatory voting changes. The legislation limits the harms caused by the Supreme Court’s *Brnovich* decision earlier this year by enshrining a private right of action and clear factors with which voters can bring lawsuits against attempts to disenfranchise them.

Fundamentally, this legislation seeks to ensure that the Justice Department possesses the tools it needs to protect the right to vote for all Americans, regardless of party or race or creed or background.

Now, you wouldn’t know by listening to the partisan rancor of today’s politics, but this goal—protecting our right to vote—has never been a partisan issue.

John Lewis once said: “We all know this is not a Democratic Republican issue. It is an American one.”

Truer words haven’t been spoken.

We should remember that reauthorizing the Voting Rights Act on a bipartisan basis is the way we have always done it. The core provisions of the Voting Rights Act have been reauthorized five times. Remember that, five times. Every time, this has been done with overwhelming bipartisan support in Congress. It was signed by President Nixon. It was signed by President Reagan. It was signed by President George W. Bush. They all signed the

Voting Rights Act reauthorizations into law. They knew the profound importance of the landmark law for our democracy. In fact, the most recent Voting Rights Act reauthorization was in 2006.

And do you know what the vote was in the U.S. Senate?

Ninety-eight to zero. And many Senators still serving today, both Republican and Democrat, voted to support that legislation.

The toxic partisanship of American politics today has obscured what has, for decades, united us across party lines. This is the belief that protecting our right to vote—the very right that gives democracy its name—is bigger than party or politics. It is the belief that a system of self-government—a government of, by, and for the people—is one that is worth preserving for generations to come. It is the belief that government exists to serve the will of the people, not the other way around.

And that, Mr. President, is what I believe.

And so, today, I hold the memory of John Lewis—of his advocacy, of his passion, of his zealous belief to our better angels—to urge all Senators, regardless of party, to join me in restoring and reauthorizing the Voting Rights Act. The John Lewis Voting Rights Advancement Act gives us that opportunity. Congressman Lewis, I know, would have wanted us to come together and find a path forward to addressing the many threats facing Americans’ foundational right to vote.

I will tell you what he would not have accepted. He would not have accepted inaction. So let’s try to live up to the memory and the example of John Lewis—a heroic man of action, one of my dearest friends in my years in the Congress. And I know he is watching over us. Let’s make him proud.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, first, let me thank my friend, our chairman of the Judiciary, Senator LEAHY, not only for introducing this legislation but for his dedication to voting rights over the many decades that he has served in this body. Few have done more to push voting rights to make sure people have the right to vote without some of the barriers that have always been placed in the way by people who want to discriminate against people—particularly people of color—when it comes to voting. So I thank him.

Mr. President, the story of American democracy is a messy tale of starts and stops. For over 240 years, our march to establish the United States as a full democracy has always seemed to involve two steps forward, one step back.

Today, I am proud to join my colleagues, Senators LEAHY and DURBIN, as they lead this Chamber in another bold step forward by introducing the John Lewis Voting Rights Advancement Act, a long-overdue update to the Voting Rights Act of 1965. No piece of legislation has done more to protect the franchise than the Voting Rights

Act of the sixties. Its critical preclearance provision compelled jurisdictions with recent histories of discrimination to secure Federal approval before amending their election laws.

For decades, the Senate reauthorized the VRA's preclearance provisions with bipartisan votes because both parties understood that this powerful Federal tool made our democracy stronger. Sadly, in 2013, a conservative majority on the Supreme Court gutted the VRA's preclearance and cleared the way for some of the most repressive voter suppression laws we have seen in generations.

For those Supreme Court Justices who said this is not necessary, I think they should look at what has happened since preclearance was eliminated. It is just awful, and it was one of the lowest moments of the Supreme Court in recent memory: the Shelby decision.

Now, because of that Shelby decision, in 2021, 19 States, just in this year, 2021, have enacted 33 laws that will limit Americans' access to the ballot, according to the Brennan Center for Justice at New York University. What we are seeing across the States today is nothing short of Jim Crow in the 21st century, aided and abetted and allowed by the Shelby decision, which so tied the hands of the Justice Department when discriminatory legislation was being enacted at the State level.

The Senate must fight back. We must restore the preclearance provisions of the Voting Rights Act and retrofit it to meet the challenges of the 21st century. That is what the John Lewis Voting Rights Advancement Act will do. As an important complement to the Freedom to Vote Act, it will reestablish the VRA's preclearance coverage formula—based on an updated, robust catalog of modern-day voter suppression laws—while adopting new provisions to address the next generation of suppressive voting. This new bill also responds to the Court's troubling ruling in *Brnovich* earlier this year, which even further weakened the VRA's protections against State practices that hinder minorities seeking to vote.

We have to be brutally honest. This country has to look at itself in the mirror. Racial barriers to the ballot are, regrettably, part of our past, our present, and now, with some of these decisions, part of our future. When the Nation was founded, you had to be a White male Protestant property owner in many of the States to vote. Today, we have come a long way in our struggle to live up to our country's founding promise, and this bill takes the next step by restoring the proper role of the Federal Government to protect Americans' constitutional right to participate in our democracy.

As Senator WARNOCK has so eloquently stated, we must put out the fire that is presently engulfing our democracy, and that is what the Freedom to Vote Act will do. We must build a state-of-the-art fire department to prevent future fires. That is what the re-

forms of the John Lewis Voting Rights Advancement Act will do.

This is a good bill. This is an urgent bill. As majority leader, it is my intention to hold a vote on this legislation in the near future. I am proud to designate this "S. 4" to mark its critical restoration of the section 4 preclearance formula.

We hope that all of our colleagues will join us in good faith in advancing solutions to ensure all Americans have their voices heard in their democracy. If some of our colleagues on the other side have different ideas of how to protect free and fair elections, we urge them to put them forward. But we will not be deterred just because some of our colleagues choose to stand silent with their arms crossed, content to play politics with the health of our Republic. On this issue, the Senate must act, and we will act.

I want to thank again my colleagues Senators LEAHY and DURBIN for their diligence and leadership on this important piece of legislation and for all they do to make sure this Chamber always works to strengthen our precious democracy.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I want to thank the majority leader for his encouraging and kind words and especially thank my friend and former chair of the Judiciary Committee, Senator PAT LEAHY of Vermont, for inviting other colleagues to come to the floor to speak in support of the right to vote.

Time and again in history, we have asked men and women to stand and risk their lives and, in fact, give their lives for the most fundamental premise of our democracy: the right to vote. They have fought. They have bled. They have died for that right.

Now it is under attack again—not from any foreign source. Over the past few years, our Nation has witnessed the most heavily coordinated assault on the right to vote in modern memory. Since the start of 2021, Republican legislators throughout the country have introduced over 425 pieces of legislation with provisions to make it more difficult for Americans to vote. Thirty-three of these laws were actually enacted in 19 States. Some of these laws have set new limits on voting by mail; others cut hours for polling locations. Each of these proposals is designed to achieve the same outcome: create barriers for Americans when it comes to the ballot box.

One of the strongest champions of democracy in American history was my old friend and colleague John Lewis of Georgia. Days before his passing, John wrote: "Democracy is not a state. It is an act, and each generation must do its part to help build what we called the Beloved Community, a nation and world society at peace with itself."

It is now this generation's turn to act, John, because nothing less than the survival of America's democracy is at stake.

At a moment when lawmakers across the country are railing around the Big

Lie to strip away our constitutional rights, we in this Senate must have the courage to step up and protect those rights. If the supporters of the former President of the United States are going to defame our democracy, we have to fight to defend it. We can begin by reinvigorating one of the most important pieces of legislation in modern American history: the Voting Rights Act of 1965.

I am sure there are folks who are watching this at home, saying: Wait a minute. How can a piece of legislation signed into law more than 50 years ago be the solution to today's challenge to democracy?

That is because over the past several years, there has been a sustained effort to chip away at the protections guaranteed to every American under that Voting Rights Act.

For instance, in 2013, the Supreme Court issued the decision in *Shelby County v. Holder*, essentially nullifying a key provision in the Voting Rights Act, section 5. Prior to the Court's ruling in *Shelby*, section 5 required that localities with a track record of disenfranchising voters of color through tactics as brutal as poll taxes and literacy tests would have to seek Federal approval for changes they make in their voting rules. This requirement is known as preclearance, and it could have prevented many of the restrictive voting provisions being enacted in States like Georgia and Texas today.

Just this past summer, the Supreme Court weakened another section of the Voting Rights Act with its decision in *Brnovich v. Democratic National Committee*.

With these wrongful rulings, the Supreme Court has fueled State-led efforts to suppress voters, particularly voters of color. In fact, Justice Elena Kagan wrote in her dissent to *Brnovich* that "in the last decade, this Court has treated no statute worse" than the Voting Rights Act of 1965.

It is time for Congress to uphold our constitutional obligation and restore the Voting Rights Act to its full potential. That is why we join together today to introduce a bill that would not only restore the protections of the Voting Rights Act but strengthen them.

Tomorrow, we will hold a hearing on this critical legislation in the Senate Judiciary Committee. It is called the John R. Lewis Voting Rights Advancement Act. By all means, passing this law should be a bipartisan endeavor. Historically, it always was. It wasn't until very recently that the Republicans—the party of Abraham Lincoln—decided that they would no longer join in our effort to reauthorize the Voting Rights Act. It wasn't that long ago that it was bipartisan and passed easily. The last time Congress voted to do so, in fact, the Republican minority leader, Senator MCCONNELL, came to the floor and said: "This is a piece of legislation which has worked."

Well, let's make sure we keep it working for America. In our Nation, there is no freedom more fundamental than the right to vote, and the John Lewis Voting Rights Advancement Act will help ensure that every American can exercise that right that he famously called the "precious, almost sacred" right.

I want to thank Senator LEAHY, Senator BLUMENTHAL, and my colleague Senator WARNOCK for joining us on the floor and a number of our colleagues for the collaboration and hard work on preparing this legislation for introduction and our House colleagues who passed their version of the bill earlier this summer.

I particularly want to thank the man for whom this bill is named. I was honored to count him as a friend—even more when he came in on more than one occasion at my invitation to campaign in the State of Illinois. I was honored to join him on a Sunday morning walk, which I will never forget, over the Edmund Pettus Bridge, John and I talking about that moment in history. It is something I will treasure for a lifetime.

We, in his name, need to honor him and to honor the principles that he gave his life for, making certain that everyone has an opportunity to help us build a beloved community.

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, I am so proud and honored to be with my colleagues Senator LEAHY, Senator DURBIN, and Senator WARNOCK—all of us who are championing the Senate version of the John R. Lewis Voting Rights Advancement Act. I think any of us would be honored to be spearheading a bill named for one of our heroes.

This bill has particular significance to all of us because we lived through the time—the summer of 1965—when States mercilessly attacked John Lewis and 600 others as they crossed the Edmund Pettus Bridge in Selma, AL, in peaceful protest to protect their right to vote.

In the wake of that attack, as the Nation came together to grieve, President Johnson joined with Congress to pursue, as he put it, "an end to voting discrimination in America."

Roughly a week after the attack, President Johnson called for comprehensive voting rights legislation. Two days later, Congress announced that it would take up that legislation. So by early August, just 5 months after "Bloody Sunday" in Selma, the Voting Rights Act was passed by Congress with broad bipartisan support and became, again in the words of President Johnson, "one of the most monumental laws in the entire history of American freedom."

Today, with the introduction of this legislation, we honor the legacy of John Lewis. We honor everyone involved in that great movement at the time that advanced civil rights and liberty, the most fundamental being the right to vote, and we honor the fight itself to protect the franchise.

A century after the Civil War ended, our Nation had failed to eradicate the blight of racial discrimination in voting. The promise of equality—political equality as well as economic equality—remained unfulfilled for Black citizens.

The Voting Rights Act did what even the 14th and 15th Amendments failed to do, proving to be a uniquely powerful tool with the capacity to meet ever-new forms of discrimination through its preclearance regime.

Then, in 2013, the U.S. Supreme Court, in *Shelby County*—well known to all of us—gutted, absolutely eviscerated the highly effective preclearance regime, jeopardizing the progress the Voting Rights Act made over the course of half a century.

As Justice Ginsburg said in her moving and powerful dissent in *Shelby*, until Congress enacted the Voting Rights Act's preclearance requirement, early attempts to cope with the vile infection of racial discrimination in voting "resembled battling the Hydra. Whenever one form of voting discrimination was identified and prohibited, others sprang up in their place."

Today's reinvigorated efforts to deprive members of minority groups from equal access to the ballot box through more subtle, second-generation barriers prove that a new preclearance regime is needed now more than ever.

This year alone, we have experienced the most destructive legislative session for voting rights in generations, with States and localities enacting a torrent of new voting restrictions, all of it designed to suppress the vote, to curtail the franchise, to move back the clock on voting rights.

Between January 1 and July 14 of this year, more than 400 voting restriction bills have been introduced in 49 States—49 States—and 18 States successfully enacted 30 laws that make it harder for people to vote.

These laws make mail voting and early voting more difficult. They manipulate the boundaries of districts to reduce minority representation, and they have led to the purge of up to 3.1 million voters from the rolls in areas that were once covered by the Voting Rights Act preclearance requirement.

In short, this threat is more than just speculative, far from imaginative or suggestive. The threat is real and urgent. In fact, it is more than a threat. It is action now moving forward in States.

Today's legislation would confront this resurgence of voting restrictions very directly. The new John Lewis Voting Rights Advancement Act includes new formulas to revive preclearance.

By focusing specifically on jurisdictions with a proven history of discrimination and on preventing specific known discriminatory practices from taking effect in areas of increasing diversity before they can do damage, this new preclearance coverage formula responds to the Supreme Court's concerns and will allow the Voting Rights Act to keep pace with present condi-

tions and America's rapidly changing demographics.

The bill also reinvigorates the Department of Justice's ability to challenge discriminatory laws already in effect, reversing the Supreme Court's latest attack on Section 2 of the Voting Rights Act in *Brnovich v. Democratic National Committee*. That 6–3 partisan decision was a stunning display of judicial overreach—a highly political, highly partisan decision that gives new meaning to the phrase "judicial activism," a case of judicial overreach.

Protecting the right to vote, very simply, should not be a partisan issue. In fact, voting rights are widely supported throughout American society—on the left, right, center, private, and in public sectors.

Since the original inception of the Voting Rights Act of 1965, overwhelming bipartisan majorities of both Houses of Congress reauthorized the Voting Rights Act five times.

Let me repeat: Both Houses of Congress, bipartisan majority, overwhelming vote, five times since the original passage of the Voting Rights Act in 1965.

And for nearly a century after the Civil War and before the Voting Rights Act, the scourge of racial discrimination in voting challenged our Nation's core commitment to these ideals of democracy. From that century of sacrifice and suffering came the Voting Rights Act and its extraordinary commitment to realizing our Nation's highest ideals; and for decades, it worked with bipartisan support overwhelmingly.

The Judiciary Committee, under the leadership of Senator DURBIN and Senator LEAHY, has documented powerfully the need for this Act.

And my Subcommittee on the Constitution has held one hearing already. We will have another shortly that will set the record—in fact, provide the evidentiary support—that the Supreme Court erroneously found lacking in its *Shelby* decision.

As a tsunami of voter suppression bills crashes against the shores of our democracy, my hope is that today we can renew a bipartisan commitment to protecting voting rights in this country.

I am proud to help lead this effort in the Senate, and I want to thank my colleagues again for being on the floor today.

Mr. WARNOCK. Mr. President, as a proud son of the great State of Georgia and a voice for our State here in this Chamber, I am deeply honored to join my colleagues here today to introduce this important legislation in honor of one of Georgia's and America's most influential public servants.

I am grateful for the comments of Senator BLUMENTHAL, and I want to thank Senator LEAHY and all of my colleagues for their leadership in introducing this bill that carries on the legacy of Congressman Lewis's pivotal

work to protect the sacred right to vote.

John Lewis was my parishioner, and as I stand in support of this legislation named in his honor, I think of the many conversations I had with him over the years. I think of the Sunday mornings we boarded a bus, taking souls to the polls because I believe that voting, as he did, is a sacred undertaking. At root, it is about people's voice. And in that sense, it is about one's humanity.

I learned so much from Congressman Lewis and the lessons from his lived experiences working deep in the trenches to defend and advance voting rights. He laid it all on the line. When President Johnson took his pen and signed this legislation, making it law in a real sense, what he etched had already been affirmed in blood—the risk that John Lewis took, the ultimate sacrifice that others made as they lost their lives fighting for the vote, the voice, the humanity of every child of God.

And one of the most important tools that came out of that activism, that came out of that human sacrifice—one of the most important tools in this legislation is the process of preclearance. This process required that jurisdictions with a proven history of voting rights violations get approval from the Department of Justice or our Federal courts before making changes to local voting administration.

And, for decades, this was the tool that helped enfranchise countless voters, ensuring that they would have access to the ballot to exercise their constitutional right, and it kept some of the worst voter suppression efforts at bay.

And then, in 2013, the Supreme Court, in *Shelby v. Holder*, asked the Congress to update the coverage formula that determines which States are subject to preclearance. The Supreme Court said that this preclearance formula had somehow been outdated and Congress ought to bring it up to date. That is what they asked us to do in 2013.

Since then, Congress has been unwilling to act. Preclearance has been allowed to atrophy. And we have seen the results not only in Georgia, but in Texas, in Arizona, in Pennsylvania, all across our country. Earlier this year in Georgia, State leaders enacted a voter suppression law that will undoubtedly make it harder for some people to vote. If the tool of preclearance were in place right now, SB202 in Georgia likely would not even be on the books.

I think of Justice Ruth Bader Ginsburg in her dissenting opinion. When that decision came down, she said:

Throwing out preclearance when it has worked and is continuing to work to stop discriminatory changes is like throwing away your umbrella in a rainstorm because you are not getting wet.

We threw away our umbrella, and we have found ourselves in the midst of a torrential rainstorm. Voter suppression laws are mushrooming all over the country. We are witnessing right now

what happens to our democracy without the protections of preclearance and the other vital provisions of the Voting Rights Act.

The lack of robust voting rights protections has ramifications for every American, as we have seen efforts ramp up this year at passing sweeping, State-level voter suppression laws—not laws that only impact Black people and people of color, to be sure, but also students, seniors, whomever certain politicians are afraid of will somehow get in the way of their craven march to power.

And so this bill, the John Lewis Voting Rights Advancement Act, is about Congress finally doing its job—finally doing what the Supreme Court asked us to do in 2013. It should have been done a long time ago.

The updated Voting Rights Advancement Act we are introducing today restores the Voting Rights Act of 1965. It strengthens our democracy by reestablishing preclearance, and it makes it better by updating it to also protect against specific practices we know suppress the vote, like polling place closures and new types of voter roll purges happening not only in the South, but all over the country.

Our bill also restores Section 2 of the Voting Rights Act to protect minority communities from discriminatory voting practices after the Supreme Court diminished Section 2 earlier this year.

Mr. President, just like the Freedom to Vote Act me and many of my colleagues introduced just a few weeks ago to set national standards for voting so every eligible voice is heard, the John Lewis Voting Rights Advancement Act we introduce today is designed to meet future challenges and address additional antidemocratic efforts aimed at suppressing the vote all over our country.

Since I was elected on January 5, since that terrible day on January 6, when this very Capitol was assaulted, we have seen more than 400 proposals in 49 States. So the John Lewis Voting Rights Advancement Act builds for us a fire station to protect against future fires, but the house of democracy is already on fire. And so we need the John Lewis Voting Rights Advancement Act, but we also need the Freedom to Vote Act. We have got to put out the fire. We have got to build a fire station for future fires.

Mr. President, I know there is a lot on our plate, but we can't waste any time getting these bills passed. We can walk and chew gum at the same time.

John Lewis walked across a bridge in order to build a bridge to a new American future. We already had infrastructure. He understood that the infrastructure of our democracy was in trouble, and so he walked across a bridge in order to build a bridge.

So the House has already passed a version of this act. And I know my friend, Senator JOE MANCHIN, has been having conversations about the Freedom to Vote Act with our friends

across the aisle. We are happy to talk to anybody on both sides of the aisle. A similar version of this legislation has been voted up by this Chamber repeatedly in the past with strong bipartisan support. Some 16 Republican Senators who were either here or in the House when it passed in 2006 98-0 are here today, and I ask them: What is the difference?

Voting rights are not just another issue. Voting rights are a preservative of all other rights. Voting rights are about the foundation of our democracy. And I believe that if the world's greatest deliberative body can't find a way forward to get this done, history will judge us harshly, and rightly so.

Reinhold Niebuhr said that humankind's capacity for justice makes democracy possible, but our inclination to injustice makes democracy necessary. This work, this assignment, which we have right now, is both possible and necessary. We can do it, and we must do it. It is the most important thing we can do this Congress, and I hope we will do it now.

Mr. LUJAN. Mr. President, it is an honor to speak in support of the John Lewis Voting Rights Advancement Act to protect the voting rights of all Americans.

Our democracy is at its strongest when every American can participate and make their voice heard—something that our friend, our colleague, a mentor to many of us, the late John Lewis—it is what he fought for his entire life. But in too many communities across America, voter suppression efforts are making it harder for Americans to vote, especially Native Americans, who continue to experience geographic, linguistic, and legal barriers.

That is why I am proud that the John Lewis Voting Rights Advancement Act includes the Native American Voting Rights Act, which I was proud to introduce in August in the Senate and spent years fighting for in the House, developing this legislation with voting rights advocates across America. This much needed legislation would protect the sacred right to vote and reduce barriers to the ballot box for voters living on Tribal lands—vital progress to protect the sacred right to vote for all Americans.

This past year, America has seen unprecedented efforts to restrict access to the ballot box, to make it harder to vote, and silence our voices, especially Native voices. It is unacceptable, and it is all the more reason why the Senate must pass robust voting rights legislation that empowers Tribes and Native American voters, because our democracy is strongest when everyone participates.

It is our moral imperative to protect the right to vote, to combat the discrimination that has long kept Americans from exercising this right. With millions of Americans calling on this body to deliver on voting rights legislation, I strongly support the John Lewis Voting Rights Advancement Act. It is

the right thing to do. It is the time to get this done.

By Mr. CARDIN (for himself, Mr. DURBIN, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. KAINE, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. MARKEY, Ms. ROSEN, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. PETERS, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. PADILLA, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. LUJÁN, and Mr. SANDERS):

S. 2937. A bill to authorize humanitarian assistance and civil society support, promote democracy and human rights, and impose targeted sanctions with respect to human rights abuses in Burma, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. CARDIN, Mr. President, I rise today to introduce the Burma Unified through Rigorous Military Accountability Act of 2021, BURMA, which is cosponsored by Senators DURBIN, MARKEY, MERKLEY, FEINSTEIN, KAINE, ROSEN, MURRAY, PETERS, KLOBUCHAR, PADILLA, WYDEN, and LUJÁN.

We are doing so in tandem with simultaneous introduction of a companion bill today in the House of Representatives by House Foreign Affairs Committee Chairman MEEKS, along with Representatives CHABOT and McCAUL and others. The purpose in short is to provide a legislative foundation to certain steps the Biden administration has undertaken by Executive order and to push the executive branch to be even more forward-leaning in addressing the February 1 coup d'état and the ongoing human rights being committed by the Burmese military, the Tatmadaw. The legislation includes authorization to impose sanctions on individuals and entities who helped stage the February 1 coup d'état and are responsible for the subsequent repression of fundamental freedoms, human rights abuses, use of indiscriminate violence towards civilians, and other gross atrocities; authorization to prohibit the import of precious and semi-precious gemstones from Burma into the United States; authorization for a new position at the State Department, a Special Coordinator for Burmese Democracy, to promote an international effort to impose and enforce multilateral sanctions on Burma and coordinate U.S. Government interagency efforts on Burma; authorization for support to civil society and for humanitarian assistance in Burma, Bangladesh, Thailand, and the surrounding region; requires the Secretary of State to make a determination whether the persecution of the Rohingya in Burma constitutes genocide; and a call for the United States to take more decisive action with regard to Burma at the United Nations.

Throughout its independence, Burma's history has suffered decades of repressive military rule and civil war with ethnic minority groups, and what we are seeing today in Burma is no different.

In 1988, thousands of people took the streets to protest the government. Under the leadership of then-General

Ne Win, who ruled for 26 years following a coup, security forces cracked down on protestors, killing thousands of citizens. During these uprisings, Aung San Suu Kyi emerged as a charismatic national icon, preaching democracy and nonviolence as she highlighted the political situation in Burma.

In 1990, the military junta agreed to hold the first multiparty elections in 30 years in which Aung San Suu Kyi's party, the National League for Democracy, won 81 percent of the seats in the government with over 70 percent voter turnout. However, the ray of hope in Burma was quickly diminished when the military refused to recognize the results and hand over power. Aung San Suu Kyi was detained and remained under house arrest for nearly 15 years—until her release in 2010 as the country continued to be ruled by the military.

In 2011, President Thein Sein agreed to a series of reforms, including granting amnesty to political prisoners, relaxing media censorship, and implementing economic policies to encourage foreign investment. Aung San Suu Kyi became a member of Parliament when her party won 43 of the 45 vacant seats in the 2012 by-elections, as ongoing negotiations between civilians and military officials continued.

In 2015, Myanmar held its first nationwide, multiparty elections—considered to be the freest and fairest elections in decades—since the country's transition away from military rule. Her party boycotted the 2010 elections, resulting in a decisive victory for the military-backed Union Solidarity and Development Party. In the 2015 elections, Aung San Suu Kyi's party won a landslide victory, taking 86 percent of the seats in the Assembly of the Union. Although she was prohibited from becoming the President due to a clause in the constitution specifically to keep her from office, she assumed the role of State Counsellor of Myanmar. Yet, despite the façade of civilian governance that had been established in Burma, the real political power continued to rest in the hands of the military.

Three years on, following decades of ongoing persecution, including confinement to ghettos, stripping away of citizenship rights, restrictions on healthcare and fertility, military unleashed a horrifying display of state-sanctioned violence in Rakhine state in August 2017, which resulted in wide-scale human rights violation, including tens of thousands of deaths, sexual violence, torture, unlawful arrest and detention, and widespread destruction of the Rohingya people's homes and communities. Over 736,000 survivors fled to refugee camps in Bangladesh, where they remain to this day, in urgent need of humanitarian aid, increased support—and justice.

Since 2019, I joined my colleagues in the Senate in calling on directing the State Department to determine whether attacks by the Burmese military

and security forces against the Rohingya constitutes genocide. The United States has still not issued a determination on whether the atrocities committed against the Rohingya constitute genocide, even though human rights investigators funded by the State Department concluded in 2018 that “there are reasonable grounds to believe that genocide was committed.” U.N. investigators have also found evidence that infers genocidal intent. This is something my colleagues and I address in our BURMA bill. The United States should lead in calling what happened what it is: a genocide.

On February 1, 2021, the Burmese military led a coup against the democratically elected legislature, just hours before the Parliament was scheduled to be seated terrifying setback for the emerging potential for democracy and rule-of-law in Burma.

Since seizing control, the military forces have killed over a thousand people across the country as they crack down on civilian protestors who have mobilized to oppose the ongoing assault on the country's nascent political institutions and traditions. Rather than follow the outcome of the parliamentary elections held last November, the Burmese military has detained Aung San Suu Kyi, President Win Myint, and other civilians, including other government officials. The military has also cut internet and telephone communication, and it has stopped flights in the country.

For years, the Burmese military has been responsible for much of the violence against minority groups in Burma, including the Rohingya. More than 1 million Rohingya have fled the country and become refugees as a result of the military's atrocities against them. This coup d'état further damages democratic institutions in Burma and makes the entire region less stable.

As the death toll in Myanmar continues to rise, the United States must not be indifferent to Burma's fate. The Burmese military has also been responsible for horrible atrocities committed against minority groups in Burma, including the Rohingya, which has led more than 1 million to flee the country and become refugees. In recent months, the Tatmadaw, the country's military, escalated its brutal campaign, using COVID-19 like a biological weapon to terrorize and control the people of Burma. The military has arrested government officials, doctors, nurses, and journalist, including U.S. citizen Danny Fester.

The bill aims to authorize sanctions on individuals and entities who helped stage the February 1 coup d'état and are responsible for the subsequent repression of fundamental freedoms, human rights abuses, use of indiscriminate violence towards civilians, and other gross atrocities; authorizes increased humanitarian assistance for Rohingya refugees and provides support for civil society and independent media; prohibits the import of

gemstones from Burma into the United States; calls for the United States to pressure the United Nations to take more decisive action with regards to Burma; and requests a genocide determination regarding the persecution of the Rohingya.

It is important for the international community to continue to pressure the military junta to restore democracy for the people of Burma. The behavior of the Tatmadaw has not and will not change—thus the need for additional & forceful actions by the United States and international community to bring justice, accountability, and restore democracy.

I remain committed to continuing to work with the Biden administration and my colleagues in Congress to ensure that the United States and international response to the military coup is coordinated and targeted to have a strong impact on those responsible, while also encouraging a peaceful transition of power back to the civilian government. I continue to stand in solidarity with the people of Burma and condemn the ongoing violence against them.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. President, I have 9 requests for committees to meet during today's session of the Senate. They have the approval of the Majority and Minority Leaders.

Pursuant to rule XXVI, paragraph 5(a), of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the following committees are authorized to meet during today's session of the Senate:

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

The Committee on Armed Services is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, October 5, 2021, at 9:30 a.m., to conduct a hearing on nominations.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING, HOUSING, AND URBAN AFFAIRS

The Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, October 5, 2021, at 9:45 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING, HOUSING, AND URBAN AFFAIRS

The Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs is authorized to meet in executive session during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, October 5, 2021, at 9:45 a.m., to vote on nominations.

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

The Committee on Energy and Natural Resources is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, October 5, 2021, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

The Committee on Foreign Relations is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, October 5, 2021, at 10:15 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

The Committee on Foreign Relations is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, October 5, 2021, at 2:30 p.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

The Committee on the Judiciary is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, October 5, 2021, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

The Select Committee on Intelligence is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, October 5, 2021, at 2:30 p.m., to conduct a closed briefing.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON CONSUMER PROTECTION, PRODUCT SAFETY, AND DATA SECURITY

The Subcommittee on Consumer Protection, Product Safety, and Data Security is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, October 5, 2021, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

MEASURE READ THE FIRST TIME—S. 4

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I understand there is a bill at the desk, and I ask for its first reading.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the bill by title for the first time.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 4) to amend the Voting Rights Act of 1965 to revise the criteria for determining which States and political subdivisions are subject to section 4 of the Act, and for other purposes.

Mr. WARNER. I now ask for a second reading, and in order to place the bill on the calendar under the provisions of rule XIV, I object to my own request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The objection having been heard, the bill will be read a second time on the next legislative day.

ORDERS FOR WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 6, 2021

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 10 a.m., Wednesday, October 6; that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, and morning business be closed; that upon conclusion of morning business, the Senate proceed to executive session to resume consideration of the Merriam nomination; further, that the cloture motion on the Merriam nomination ripen at 11:30 a.m.; that if cloture is invoked on the nomination, all postcloture time expire at 2:15 p.m.; finally, if the nomination is confirmed, that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table, the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action,

and the Senate then resume legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. WARNER. If there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it stand adjourned under the previous order following the remarks of Senators BARASSO and COLLINS.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Maine.

CONFIRMATION OF DARCIE N. McELWEE

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, it is with a great deal of hometown pride that I rise in strong support of the confirmation of Darcie McElwee to be the new U.S. attorney for the State of Maine. Both Darcie and I are natives of the northern Maine community of Caribou.

Since 2002, Darcie has been an assistant U.S. attorney, and she has served as the Project Safe Neighborhoods coordinator for that office since 2005. She primarily has prosecuted violent crime cases, including those involving sex trafficking, interstate domestic violence, and child sexual exploitation, as well as firearms and arson cases. Darcie served as assistant district attorney for Penobscot County and Piscataquis County from 1998 to 2002.

Darcie is a member of the Maine Trial Lawyers Association and a past president of the Cumberland Bar Association. She has also served as an adjunct professor at the University of Maine School of Law and at the Maine Trial Lawyers College of Advocacy. Darcie received her J.D. degree from the University of Maine School of Law in 1998, and her undergraduate degree from Bowdoin College.

Throughout her career, Darcie has worked tirelessly to keep Mainers safe from violent crime and to achieve justice for victims. She is an intelligent, experienced, and highly competent law enforcement professional. Her extensive track record as a career prosecutor makes her ideally suited for this important position.

Based on her experience and her character, as well as her Caribou roots, I have every confidence that Darcie will faithfully uphold our Nation's laws and work to ensure public safety and order. Throughout her distinguished career, she has demonstrated a strong commitment to public service, and I know that she will serve the State of Maine and our Nation extremely well as Maine's next U.S. attorney.

I am absolutely delighted that the Senate, without dissent, tonight confirmed Darcie McElwee for this important position.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

BORDER SECURITY

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I come to the floor tonight to talk about a crisis that is continuing at our southern border. It is a crisis that Joe Biden created, and it is a crisis that he has only made worse.

Let me just tell you, the White House knows that it is getting worse. Leaks from the administration claim they are preparing for the possibility that the illegal immigration, over the next month, will double—double. This would mean 400,000 illegal immigrants reaching our border next month. This isn't just a record; this is nearly double of a record. This isn't just a crisis; this is an invasion.

In the month of August, more than 200,000 illegal immigrants crossed our border. This is the most ever seen in the month of August in the last 21 years. In July, we saw more illegal immigrants than in any 1 month in 21 years.

Since President Biden has taken office, we have seen recordbreaking month after recordbreaking month of illegal immigrants coming to this country. Our border is now wide open, and the rest of the world knows it.

In recent weeks, we saw tens of thousands of illegal immigrants crowd a single bridge in Del Rio, TX. According to the U.S. Secretary of Homeland Security, 30,000 people crossed into Del Rio in just 15 days. That was from September 9 through September 24.

This is just the beginning. Now there are reports there are up to 60,000 more Haitians making their way to our border. And what happened in Del Rio is about to happen all over again on a much larger scale.

The Foreign Minister of Panama recently said: "We sounded the alarm" about the last caravan. She said she warned the Biden administration. Yet the Biden administration did nothing.

More than a million illegal immigrants have crossed our southern border since President Biden has taken office. This is more than double the population of my home State of Wyoming. Many of these people are carrying deadly diseases. Last week, the Homeland Security Secretary admitted one in five—this is from the Secretary of Homeland Security—one in five illegal immigrants crossing our border carries an illness. This could mean 40,000 illegal immigrants brought disease across our border just this past month.

In many cases, these people are then being sent all across the country to then stay there. Last week, the Homeland Security Secretary announced up to 12,000 of the illegal immigrants in Del Rio had been released into the United States—not sent to their home but sent into the United States.

Oh, they are supposed to show up in court someday. Yet this will probably never happen. That has been the history of this—probably never show up in court. Instead, they will settle down in the United States and never leave. The lack of enforcement of the law by this

administration is silent amnesty. The illegal immigrants know it, and the Democrats in this Chamber and in Washington know it as well.

Many of these immigrants coming have applied for asylum, but it is highly unlikely these Del Rio immigrants actually would ever qualify for asylum. Most of them have been living in South America. In other words, they are not fleeing their home country. They already fled their home country to a safe third country where they were living.

The current caravan is marching hundreds of miles through half a dozen countries. Asylum is only for people fleeing persecution. They are not. These people don't qualify for asylum. They have no right to come here. A competent administration would prevent them, stop them, from coming here.

If they want to apply for asylum, they should remain in Mexico. Under the previous President, that is what was required. The "Remain in Mexico" policy was extremely successful and effective. Yet President Biden ended it on his very first day in office.

Last month, a Federal judge ruled President Biden broke the law by ending it so suddenly. Now President Biden has to bring it back. Yet the administration has already announced that they are going to try to end it again.

Two weeks ago, a judge also restricted the public health order called title 42. This a public health order which expels illegal immigrants from places where coronavirus is spreading. A Federal judge restricted title 42 to expelling single adults. Then the Biden administration appealed the ruling and asked to keep the order in place. Now an appeals judge has allowed it to continue while the appeal moves forward.

If this appeal is not successful, we will see an additional tidal wave of illegal immigration. When I visited the border earlier this year, Border Patrol told me title 42 was their last line of defense. If title 42 is struck down, illegal immigration could double overnight.

The Biden administration has also announced a new policy on deportations. Under the new rules, many illegal immigrants who commit crimes, amazingly, will not be deported. The policy explicitly says: "Personnel should not rely on the fact of conviction"—should not rely on the fact of conviction—"when determining whom to deport." This is not accused of a crime. This is convicted of a crime.

The policy lists out a host of mitigating factors. They include age, length of time in the United States, mental or physical health problems, and the potential impact on their family. We are talking about convicted criminals. These mitigating factors are largely subjective.

In effect, Homeland Security now has license to not deport people who should, by law, be deported. This lack of effective enforcement is a silent amnesty.

Here, in the Senate, Democrats just tried to pass amnesty for 8 million illegal immigrants. They failed. Yet it turns out they didn't need to pass it. The Biden administration will just let people stay.

And I will tell you, people around this country, when they see what this administration is doing at the border, they are furious. They are offended. Amnesty only strengthens the magnet for people to come here illegally. As long as Democrats give amnesty and government benefits to illegal immigrants, of course, we will continue to have a border crisis.

Last week, former President Barack Obama gave an interview. He was asked about the crisis on the southern border. He had something to say. It was on ABC "Good Morning America," and I hope it is something that President Biden has heard or listened to.

President Obama said:

We are a nation state. We have borders. The idea that we can have open borders is unsustainable.

Unsustainable. That is President Barack Obama, former member of this Senate, a two-term President of the United States, saying what is happening now is unsustainable. And President Obama is absolutely right. It is unsustainable. It is leading to tragedies like one we saw in Yuma, AZ, just this August.

Border Patrol agents, sadly, found a 2-year-old boy from Colombia. He was next to the dead bodies of his 11-year-old sister and their mother. We later found out his mother's name was Claudia Peña. She had called 9-1-1, and in the background of the call, the dispatchers heard a child saying: Mommy, I am hungry.

The family had flown to Mexico from Colombia. Then they were smuggled over the border by a trafficker. They were seeking to be reunited with the father of the family. Now they will never be reunited.

And stories like this one, heart-breaking stories, happen on a regular basis because our border is open. They are going to keep happening as long as the border remains open and as long as the President continues to send the message to attract more to come here illegally.

We know what we need to do. We know what works: Finish the wall that we paid for; keep the public health rules in place; and keep the successful "Remain in Mexico" policy. Stop promising benefits—government benefits, paid benefits—to illegal immigrants. Turn off the magnet—the magnet which is drawing millions of people to risk their lives—or this stampede for the border will continue.

It is time we enforce the law. Secure this border once and for all. That is what the American people want and are not getting from this administration.

Thank you.

I yield the floor.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 A.M.
TOMORROW

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands adjourned until 10 a.m. tomorrow.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 6:41 p.m., adjourned until Wednesday, October 6, 2021, at 10 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate:

THE JUDICIARY

ARMANDO O. BONILLA, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE A JUDGE OF THE UNITED STATES COURT OF FEDERAL CLAIMS FOR A TERM OF FIFTEEN YEARS, VICE EDWARD J. DAMICH, TERM EXPIRED.

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be rear admiral

REAR ADM. (LH) PAUL J. SCHLISE

IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be colonel

CHRISTIAN M. BERGTHOLDT

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C. SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant colonel

DERRICK H. DUNLAP
JAMIE E. PITTMAN

GERALD A. ROBINSON
ROSILYN C. WOODARD

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C. SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant colonel

MICHELLE S. MCCARROLL

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

MARCUS S. SNOW

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C. SECTION 624:

To be major

AUGUSTINE A. DIMOH

IN THE MARINE CORPS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant colonel

JOHN C. MORGAN

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate October 5, 2021:

THE JUDICIARY

LAUREN J. KING, OF WASHINGTON, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON.

UNITED STATES AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

PALOMA ADAMS-ALLEN, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE A DEPUTY ADMINISTRATOR OF THE UNITED STATES AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT.

IN THE SPACE FORCE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES SPACE FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 716:

To be brigadier general

BRIG. GEN. GREGORY J. GAGNON

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

JESSICA D. ABER, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF VIRGINIA FOR THE TERM OF FOUR YEARS.

CARLA B. FREEDMAN, OF NEW YORK, TO BE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK FOR THE TERM OF FOUR YEARS.

WILLIAM J. IHLENFELD II, OF WEST VIRGINIA, TO BE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF WEST VIRGINIA FOR THE TERM OF FOUR YEARS.

CHRISTOPHER R. KAVANAUGH, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF VIRGINIA FOR THE TERM OF FOUR YEARS.

DARCIE N. MCELWEE, OF MAINE, TO BE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY FOR THE DISTRICT OF MAINE FOR THE TERM OF FOUR YEARS.

BREON S. PEACE, OF NEW JERSEY, TO BE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK FOR THE TERM OF FOUR YEARS.

WILLIAM S. THOMPSON, OF WEST VIRGINIA, TO BE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF WEST VIRGINIA FOR THE TERM OF FOUR YEARS.

DAMIAN WILLIAMS, OF NEW YORK, TO BE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK FOR THE TERM OF FOUR YEARS.

WITHDRAWAL

Executive Message transmitted by the President to the Senate on October 5, 2021 withdrawing from further Senate consideration the following nomination:

ARMANDO O. BONILLA, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE A JUDGE OF THE UNITED STATES COURT OF FEDERAL CLAIMS FOR A TERM OF FIFTEEN YEARS, VICE EDWARD J. DAMICH, TERM EXPIRED, WHICH WAS SENT TO THE SENATE ON JULY 13, 2021.